DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 393 CE 001 960

AUTHOR	Fisher, Allan H., Jr.; And Others
TITLE	Enrollment Potential for College-Based Military Officer Training Programs: A Comparison of Results of Surveys Conducted in May 1972 and May 1973.
INSTITUTION	Air Force Human Resources Lab., Alexandria, Va. Manpower Development Div.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (DOD), Washington, D.C. Directorate for Manpower Research.
REPORT NO	AFHRL-TR-74-23; OASD(M&RA)-MR-74-3
PUB DATE	Jan 74
NOTE	102p.; For related documents, see ED 072 185 and CE 001 961
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*College Bound Students; Educational Opportunities; Grade 12; *Interest Research; Military Personnel; *Military Training; *Motivation; *Officer Personnel; Seniors; Surveys; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	Reserve Officers Training Corps; ROTC

ABSTRACT

The interest of college-bound high school seniors in applying for college-based military officer training programs was assessed. Comparisons were made between surveys conducted in 1972 and 1973. It was found that the Air Force and the Navy ROTC scholarship programs were the most popular with the youth surveyed. Higher likelihood of applying was found among youths from low income families. Travel, adventure and the opportunity for technical and professional training were strong motivators in applying for officer training programs. Prominent among the specific reasons for affiliating with military programs were: being able to attend the college of one's choice; getting tuition paid; and the term of obligated service. There was very little awareness of officer compensation and the service sponsorship of the various programs offered. (Author)

ED 095393

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Report MR 74-3

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM

Enrollment Potential for College-Based Military Officer Training Programs:

A Comparison of Results of Surveys Conducted in May 1972 and May 1973

Manpower Development Division
Air Force Human Resources Laboratory

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

LE001 96d

Sponsored by

Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense
Manpower and Reserve Affairs
Directorate for Manpower Systems Evaluation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NOTICE

When US Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related Government procurement operation, the Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise, as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

This report was submitted by the Manpower Development Branch, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Alexandria, Virginia 22314, to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs).

This report has been reviewed and cleared for open publication and/or public release by the Directorate for Security Review (Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense-Public Affairs) in accordance with DoD Directive 5230.9. There is no objection to unlimited distribution of this report to the public at large, or by DDC to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER OASD(M&RA) MR 74-3 AFHRL-TR-74-23	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) ENROLLMENT POTENTIAL FOR COLLEGE-BASED MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS: A Comparison of Results Conducted in May 1972 and May 1973		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Memorandum 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER AFHRL-TR-74-23
7. AUTHOR(s) Allan H. Fisher, Jr. Margi R. Harford Martha R. DiSario		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) F41609-73-C-0030
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Manpower Development Branch Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC) Alexandria, Virginia 22314		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS PE 62703F Project 4499-07-50
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) Directorate for Manpower Systems Evaluation Washington, D.C. 20301		12. REPORT DATE January 1974 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 102
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

Performed under WU 4499-07-50, Contract F41609-73-C-0030, Human Resources Research Organization, 300 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Officer training
Career intent
ROTC
Applicants

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

The interest of college-bound high school seniors in applying for college-based military officer training programs was assessed. Comparisons were made between surveys conducted in 1972 and 1973. It was found that the Air Force and the Navy ROTC scholarship programs were the most popular with the youth surveyed. Higher likelihood of applying was found among youths from low income families. Travel, adventure and the opportunity for technical and professional training were strong motivators in applying for officer training programs. Prominent among the specific reasons for affiliating with military

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Item 20 (Continued)

programs were: being able to attend the college of one's choice; getting tuition paid; and the term of obligated service. There was very little awareness of officer compensation and the service sponsorship of the various programs offered.

SUMMARY

ENROLLMENT POTENTIAL

In 1973 and 1972, the majority of both male and female college-bound high school seniors expressed a willingness to attend college under some type of subsidization (see Table I-1a). From 1972 to 1973, there was an increase in the number of females endorsing subsidization from 74% to 81%. The level of endorsement for men was unchanged at about 80% (see Table I-1a). However, far fewer youth in each survey expressed a willingness to accept subsidization in the form of a military officer scholarship, i.e., only 28% for men and 18% for women in 1973 (see Table I-1b). Further, the reported rate of actual application for an ROTC scholarship was substantially below this rate of expressed willingness to accept a military scholarship. Only 7% of the men and 4% of the women reported applying for ROTC in 1973 (see Table I-2).

Expressed interest in applying for enrollment in any particular one of the ROTC Scholarship programs or ROTC Non-scholarship programs remained constant from 1972 to 1973. For example, there were no differences from 1972 to 1973 in the level of preference for Army ROTC programs, regardless of the type of program (full Scholarship/Subsistence only). In each survey there were also no differences in Army ROTC enrollment potential between the scholarship and non-scholarship programs, or between male and female respondents (see Table I-3). Similar results were noted for Navy ROTC programs (see Table I-3). However, some differences in enrollment potential were found for Air Force ROTC programs. In each survey, slightly more males than females expressed an interest in one of the USAF ROTC programs. Also, more interest was accorded the USAF Scholarship program than the USAF

Non-scholarship program (see Table I-3). But no change in enrollment potential for Air Force (or Army or Navy) ROTC was found from 1972 to 1973.

For the off-campus programs, the following generalizations held: (1) there were no changes in enrollment potential from 1972 to 1973; but (2) the appeal for Ground (or Surface) programs tended to exceed the appeal of Flight programs in each survey. Thus, the PLC Ground program appealed to more youth than did the PLC Navigator or the PLC Flight Officer programs, and the ROC program appealed to more youth than did the AVROC-Pilot and AVROC-Navigator programs. In addition, men were more likely to be attracted to the Flight programs than women. (See table I-4 for results for the PLC programs and the ROC/AVROC programs.)

Finally, when youth in both surveys were asked to select the single program they most preferred, both men and women endorsed the Air Force ROTC Scholarship program. Second choice among males in both surveys was the Navy ROTC Scholarship program. Second choice for females in both surveys was the Army ROTC Non-scholarship program (see Table I-5).

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF POTENTIAL ROTC APPLICANTS

Enrollment potential for ROTC and other off-campus military officer training programs was evaluated in terms of the following demographic characteristics of the respondent: age, race, annual family income, current employment status, city size and geographic area. Few substantial relationships were found between enrollment potential and the characteristics of the respondent. Many results were idiosyncratic, i.e., they applied to only certain programs for a certain sex of respondent. Further, considering both 1972 and 1973 survey results, there were very few instances of demographic characteristics related to enrollment potential

in a consistent manner across time. A few interesting exceptions are discussed below.

In both surveys, there were generally somewhat higher rates of applicant potential for Air Force ROTC programs among youth from families with annual incomes under $8,000, in comparison to rates of enrollment potential for the respondent samples in general. These results were found among men for the ROTC Non-scholarship program. Similar results were found for both the ROTC Scholarship and Non-scholarship programs among women (see Tables II-2 through II-4).

In the 1973 survey, there was also a higher rate of applicant potential for the Army ROTC programs (both Scholarship and Non-scholarship) among male respondents from families with $8,000-$14,000 incomes per annum (see Tables II-1 and II-3).

Non-white male and female respondents in 1973 generally showed higher applicant potential for Army ROTC programs than did the total samples of men and women (see Tables II-2 through II-4). However, the difference was not significant for males in terms of the Army ROTC Scholarship program. In both surveys, non-white females had a higher applicant potential for the PLC-Ground program and the ROC program than did females in general (see Tables II-6 and II-8, respectively). Non-white males in both surveys expressed higher applicant potential for the AVROC-Navigator program than did males in general, but lower potential for the AVROC-Pilot program than did men in general (see Table II-7).

In both surveys, female respondents in the North Central states had a higher potential applicant rate for Navy ROTC programs than did women in general (see Tables II-2 and II-4). In each survey, male respondents

in non-metropolitan areas had higher potential applicant rate for the Air Force ROTC Scholarship program than did men in general (see Table II-1). They also showed a lower applicant potential for the Navy ROTC Non-scholarship program than did men in general (see Table II-3).

GENERAL REASONS FOR MILITARY AFFILIATION

In 1972 and 1973, "travel, adventure and new experiences" and "the opportunity for special professional/technical training" were cited most frequently as reasons exerting a strong influence in the decision to apply for military officer training programs by the total samples of men and women (see Table III-1). In general these reasons were also highly endorsed by potential applicants to the various ROTC programs in each survey (see Tables III-2, III-3, III-4, and III-5).

SPECIFIC REASONS FOR MILITARY AFFILIATION

In 1972 and 1973, the following specific reasons were most frequently endorsed as exerting a strong influence on the decision to apply for a ollege military officer training program by the total samples of men and women: (1) being able to attend the college of one's choice; (2) getting college tuition paid; (3) the term of obligated service: (4) being paid to attend college, regardless of parental income; and (5) if expense money is provided for all 4 years of college (see Table III-6). In each survey, potential applicants for the various ROTC programs particularly endorsed two reasons: (1) "obtaining the college of one's choice" and (2) "paid college tuition" (see Tables III-7, III-8, III-9, and III-10).

AWARENESS OF OFFICER COMPENSATION

A variety of questions was developed to assess the level of knowledge and awareness of ROTC and other military officer training programs among the target populations. Few respondents in either survey could estimate the correct starting salary or base pay for a beginning officer. Indeed, there was a significant decrease between surveys in the number of respondents who knew the date of the most recent officer pay increase. However, despite the low level of awareness of military officer compensation in 1973, 35% of the men and 38% of the women believed that starting officer pay and the initial salary for a civilian college graduate were essentially equivalent (see Table IV-1).

AWARENESS OF VARIOUS TRAINING PROGRAMS

In both surveys, over 95% of the respondents claimed to have heard of ROTC (see Table IV-2). However, sponsorship of the program was much more frequently attributed to the Army than to the other Services (see Table IV-3). In each survey, the general level of awareness concerning details of the ROTC program was rather limited, especially among female respondents (see Table IV-4 and Table IV-5).

In both 1972 and 1973, awareness of the various off-campus programs was considerably lower than awareness of ROTC programs (see Table IV-2). The number of males reporting that they had heard of the ROC program declined significantly from 1972 to 1973; but no other changes in awareness were found. In each survey, the majority of respondents who claimed awareness of the AVROC program incorrectly identified the program sponsor as the Air Force, instead of the Navy which actually sponsors the program (see Table IV-3).

SOURCES OF INFORMATION CONCERNING ROTC

In 1973, most youth reported exposure to advertising for ROTC. Male respondents reported a higher level of exposure to advertising for Army ROTC in 1973 than they did in 1972; no difference was found in exposure to advertising for Navy ROTC and Air Force ROTC (see Table IV-6). In 1973, female respondents reported a higher level of exposure to advertising for all of the ROTC programs than did their counterparts in the 1972 survey (see Table IV-6).

Compared to reported advertising exposure, much lower rates of learning about ROTC from personal communication were reported in both surveys. In each survey, parents/relatives/friends were listed as the major sources of personal information about ROTC (see Table IV-7).

PREFACE

This Consulting Report indicates the extent of interest among college-bound high school seniors in applying for enrollment in college-based military officer training programs (e.g., ROTC programs, and ROC, AVROC, and PLC programs) in 1973. Selected results from a similar survey conducted in 1972 are included for comparison purposes. Additional 1972 and 1973 comparisons are reported which indicate: (1) the levels of factual knowledge of, and attitudes toward, ROTC programs and other campus-based officer training programs; and (2) demographic, attitudinal and programmatic correlates of expressed interest in applying for enrollment in these programs. In total, these comparisons allow an assessment of changes in enrollment potential which may have resulted with the expiration of the draft, or as a result of other events or activities which transpired between 1972 and 1973.

This report is the first in a series of three reports which present the results of a comprehensive 1973 ROTC survey of enrollment (applicant) potential and career potential for college student military officer training programs. The second report in this series will be concerned with military career potential of current enrollees in ROTC programs. The third report in the series will consider career potential for current enrollees in one of three "off-campus" military officer training programs (ROC, AVROC, or PLC).

The 1972 and 1973 surveys were designed by Mr. George Mihaly and Mr. Gideon D. Rathnum of Gilbert Youth Research, Inc. for the Department of Defense. Gilbert Youth Research, Inc. was responsible for selecting the 1972 and 1973 samples, conducting the personal interviews, and per-

forming the data tabulations for both the 1972 and 1973 surveys.

Analyses of the data tabulations and report preparation activities were performed by HumRRO Division No. 7 (Social Science), Alexandria, Virginia, Dr. Robert G. Smith, Jr., Director. The HumRRO effort was accomplished by Dr. Allan H. Fisher, Jr., Ms. Margi R. Harford, Ms. Martha R. DiSario, and Ms. Leslie S. Rigg. HumRRO also assisted in the initial questionnaire design and development of the sample requirements.

Helpful guidance in substantive aspects of the data analyses and report preparation were provided by COL Gerald Perselay (USAF), Assistant Director for ROTC Programs (OASD, M&RA), and Mr. Samuel Saben, Manpower Research Analyst (OASD, M&RA).

The preparation of camera-ready copy of each report in this series was performed by HumRRO for the Directorate for Manpower Research of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) under Contract No. F41609-73-C-0030, Task Order No. 3 (HumRRO Project DAD-C).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	1
Preface	vii
Introduction	1
Method	2
Results	5
I. Enrollment Potential	5
II. Demographic Correlates of Potential Applicants to Military Officer Training Programs	21
III. Reasons for Military Affiliation	39
IV. Awareness of Officer Compensation, ROTC, and Other Military Officer Training Programs	65
Bibliography	81
Appendices	
A. Approximate Sampling Tolerances for Differences Between Survey Percentages	83
B. Applicant Potential Items from the Interview Questionnaire	85
C. Demographic Composition of the Surveys	89

INTRODUCTION

This survey was conceived as part of a systematic effort by the Department of Defense to study enrollment (applicant) potential for selected college-based military officer training programs on an annual basis. Previous empirical research concerning the attitudes of college-aged youth toward affiliation with the various college-based pre-commissioning programs (ROTC) has been conducted (Johnston and Bachman, 1972; N.W. Ayer, 1972). However, these studies were not designed to provide a continuing comprehensive assessment of enrollment potential but rather to indicate potential for ROTC and/or to suggest relationships which might be explored in future research.

The initial DoD survey in this series (conducted in May 1972) was designed to provide information on enrollment potential, and on the level of factual knowledge of, and attitudes toward, ROTC programs and off-campus programs of officer training among civilian youth. The survey also was designed to identify demographic, attitudinal, and programmatic correlates of expressed interest in applying for enrollment in college-based military officer training programs. The May 1973 survey constituted a replication of the May 1972 survey.

Continued research on enrollment potential over time provides an on-going measure of the acceptance of these programs among civilian youth. Further, it assures continued availability of current data necessary to appraise the reactions of youth to external events and program modifications which may impact on their attitudes toward: (1) enrollment in these programs, and (2) a future career as an officer in the military service.

METHOD

Sampling Requirement

Sampling requirements for each survey were generated by HumRRO in discussions with representatives of OASD (M&RA). Target populations were identified to correspond with the major objectives of the present study, i.e., to estimate enrollment potential for male and female youth. These populations consisted of national probability samples of male and female high school seniors. Sample requirements were approximately 500 cases for each of these high school populations. The question of potential for applying for ROTC enrollment has a reasonable basis since only those men and women who planned to achieve at least a college education were included in the sample.

Sampling Procedures

The samples employed in both the 1972 and 1973 surveys were derived from a national probability sample of youth.* The sample size for each survey is shown below, together with the population base to which the sample data was weighted for processing.

SAMPLE SIZE

Target Population**	1972 Survey		1973 Survey	
	Sample Size	Projected Population	Sample Size	Projected Population
Male High School Seniors (college-bound)	544	1,454,000	472	1,433,000
Female High School Seniors (college-bound)	481	1,432,000	461	1,425,000
	1035		933	

*See Modern Sampling Doctrine: Master Probability Sample of Young People, Gilbert Marketing Group, Inc., Marketmath, Inc., 1969.

**The 1972 survey also included a sample of male college freshmen (N=545) and female college freshmen (N=511) not enrolled in any military officer training program. However, the 1972 survey indicated that officer enrollment potential among these populations was so low that the decision was made not to resurvey these populations in the 1973 survey.

Questionnaire

An extended questionnaire was designed for the 1972 survey and maintained in essentially the same form for the 1973 survey, for purposes of comparability.

Administration

All data reported in the survey were obtained from extended personal interviews. In conducting these interviews, Gilbert Youth Research, Inc. employs peer-group interviews in conjunction with local supervision to increase the likelihood of valid responses. A systematic program of interview verification is used to insure data quality.

Data Analyses

Results for each sample were weighted for extrapolation to the respective populations. Data from high school seniors were weighted to project to the national sample of high school seniors, by sex, within geographic region.

Data analyses consisted of extensive cross-tabulations of each questionnaire item with selected demographic characteristics, and with criterion items on applicant (enrollment) potential by program. Each analysis controlled on the sex of the respondent.

RESULTS

I. ENROLLMENT POTENTIAL

THE APPEAL OF COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS

Prior to assessing enrollment potential for the various college-based military officer training programs, analyses were performed to assess the initial willingness of youth to accept:

(1) Some form of subsidy for college expenses (undifferentiated military or civilian in nature); and

(2) a college scholarship involving eventual service as a military officer.

This analysis was designed to provide a perspective on enrollment potential for ROTC and other campus-based military officer training programs.

The extent to which any form of subsidization for college expenses appealed to college-bound high school seniors was assessed in each survey. Table I-1a presents results for the 1972 and 1973 surveys, controlling on sex. The majority of respondents in both surveys indicated that they would attend college if they were subsidized. For males, there was no difference between the 1972 and 1973 surveys in the attitude toward acceptance of subsidization of college expenses (approximately 80% each year). However, the percentage of females endorsing the concept of subsidization of college expenses increased significantly between surveys, i.e., from 74% in 1972 to 81% in 1973*.

*See Appendix A for table of sample tolerances used in comparisons of the 1972 and 1973 survey results. In general, for samples of 500 cases, differences in percentages of 4% to 6% are required for statistical significance. The actual size of the difference required depends on the size of the values being compared, e.g., a larger difference is required for comparing values near 50% than for comparing values such as 10% (or 90%). See Appendix A for details.

Next, respondents in each survey were asked if they would attend college on a scholarship if military officer service was required after graduation. Only a minority of respondents in each survey expressed a willingness to accept a college scholarship involving service as a military officer. For men, the rate of acceptance was 28% in both surveys. For women, the rate of acceptance was 15% in 1972 and 18% in 1973. This difference is not statistically significant. See Table I-1b for complete results by survey administration.

In general, the majority of respondents expressed negative attitudes toward the idea of attending college on a military officer scholarship. In each survey, males were more favorable toward this concept than females. However, the concept of a military officer scholarship possessed far less appeal than the idea of college subsidy undifferentiated with respect to source or obligation (compare results in Table I-1a and I-1b).

REPORTED ROTC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATES

Another valuable perspective on stated enrollment potential for college-based military officer training programs is indicated by the extent to which respondents report actually applying for an ROTC scholarship. Respondents in each survey were asked if they had applied for, or expected to receive an ROTC Scholarship. For males, approximately 5% to 6% in each survey stated that they had either applied for, or expected to receive an ROTC scholarship. For women, the comparable rates ranged between 2% to 4% in the two surveys. There were no

ACCEPTANCE OF THE CONCEPT OF SUBSIDIZATION OF COLLEGE EXPENSES

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

	MALES		FEMALES	
	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	1972 (%)	1973 (%)
(a) Would Attend College if Subsidized by Someone				
Yes	79.4	80.3	74.4	81.3
No	8.7	7.3	8.2	5.7
Don't know	11.8	12.4	17.4	13.0
	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
(b) Would Attend College on Scholarship if Military Officer Service is Required				
Yes	28.2	28.1	15.0	17.5
No	57.8	55.3	70.7	66.7
Don't know	14.1	16.5	14.2	15.8
	100.1	99.9	99.9	100.0

TABLE I-1

significant differences in response rates between 1972 and 1973. There were also no statistically significant sex differences in reported rates of application. Table I-2 presents data for both survey administrations.

It is instructive to compare rates of actual ROTC program application (Table I-2) with expressed willingness to accept a military officer scholarship (Table I-1b). In general, there seems to be a noticeable gap between the actual behavior (i.e., applying for a military officer scholarship), and the expressed attitude (i.e., willingness to accept a military officer scholarship). In design of the research, it was hypothesized that the observed discrepancy might be found between behavior and attitude. To insure a reasoned assessment of the ROTC programs and other programs by respondents, enrollment potential for the various programs was evaluated by generating a description of each college-based military officer training program which could be provided to respondents for their consideration. The results of this research appear below.

ROTC ENROLLMENT POTENTIAL

Respondents in each survey were given a brief, standardized description of each military officer training program (see Appendix B, page B-2, for a copy of the ROTC program descriptions).*

*Program descriptions were presented to respondents for consideration rotating the order-of-presentation of each type of program to compensate for possible bias due to the order in which the respondent assessed each program.

EXPECTATIONS FOR RECEIPT OF AN ROTC SCHOLARSHIP

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

Expect/Hope to Receive an ROTC Scholarship	MALES		FEMALES	
	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	1972 (%)	1973 (%)
Have Applied (but not heard)	3.6	4.8	0.7	2.3
	5.3	6.5	2.2	4.0
Know they will Receive an ROTC Scholarship	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.7
Do not expect/hope to receive an ROTC Scholarship	94.6	93.5	97.8	96.0
	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE I-2

After reading the program description, respondents were asked to choose among the following statements:

(1) I would apply for this program ("potential enrollee");

(2) I would not apply for this program:

(3) Don't know if I would apply for this program.

Table I-3 summarizes the extent of enrollment potential for each of the Armed Services ROTC programs, controlling on survey administration and sex. Results are discussed separately by Service.

ARMY ROTC PROGRAMS.

For males, in the 1973 survey, the potential application rate for both the Army ROTC Scholarship program and the ROTC Non-scholarship program was about 13%. For females in the 1973 survey, the rates were 14% for the Scholarship program and 15% for the Non-scholarship program.

There were no statistically significant changes in enrollment potential, by program, from 1972 to 1973. There were also no differences in enrollment potential as a function of the sex of the respondent.

Controlling on the sex of the respondent, there were no differences in enrollment potential between the Scholarship program and the Non-scholarship program for the Army in either survey. (However, except for men in 1973, the Non-scholarship program had slightly higher enrollment potential than did the Scholarship program.)

NAVY ROTC PROGRAMS.

For both males and females, potential application rates of 15% to 17% for NROTC were found in the 1973 survey.

There were no significant changes in enrollment potential, by program, from 1972 to 1973. There were also no differences in enrollment potential by sex of the respondent.

ENROLLMENT POTENTIAL FOR ROTC PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

Percent Who Would Apply For:	MALES			FEMALES		
	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	Difference (%)	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	Difference (%)
Army ROTC Scholarship	11.8	13.4	+1.6	10.3	13.5	+3.2
Army ROTC Non-scholarship	14.8	12.5	-2.3	14.9	14.7	- .2
Navy ROTC Scholarship[1]	16.6	15.4	-1.2	17.2	16.6	- .6
Navy ROTC Non-scholarship[2]	14.9	16.0	+1.1	14.4	15.2	+ .8
USAF ROTC Scholarship	18.4	19.2	+ .8	15.4	14.0	-1.4
USAF ROTC Non-scholarship	15.8	14.7	-1.1	8.6	11.0	+2.4

1 This program is also known as the Regular or College program.

2 This program is also known as the Contract program.

TABLE I-3

Controlling on the sex of the respondent, there were no differences in enrollment potential for the Scholarship program and the Non-scholarship program for the Navy in either survey. (However, except for men in 1973, the Scholarship program had higher enrollment potential than did the Non-scholarship program.)

AIR FORCE ROTC PROGRAMS.

For males in the 1973 survey, the potential application rate for the USAF Scholarship program was 19%, and for the USAF Non-scholarship program was 15%. For females, the 1973 rates of applicant potential were 14% for the Scholarship program and 11% for the Non-scholarship program.

There were no significant changes in enrollment potential, by program, from 1972 to 1973.

However, there was a consistent finding in both surveys that the USAF Scholarship program had a higher potential applicant rate than the USAF Non-scholarship program. While these differences achieved only limited statistical significance (e.g., among men in 1973 and women in 1972), the consistent difference in enrollment potential favoring Scholarship programs over the Non-scholarship programs is noteworthy. As noted previously, there was no comparable difference noted for programs sponsored by either the Army or the Navy.

There is also a consistent difference between the sexes in USAF ROTC enrollment potential in both 1972 and 1973. In each survey, men reported higher enrollment potential for each USAF ROTC program than women. These differences in rates of applicant potential would achieve only limited statistical significance (e.g., for the Scholarship program in 1973 where the rates were 19.2% for men and 14.0% for women; and for the Non-scholarship program in 1972 where the rates were 15.8% for men and 8.6% for women). Nonetheless, the consistency

of this sex difference in enrollment potential is noteworthy, particularly since no corresponding sex difference in enrollment potential was found for either Army ROTC or Navy ROTC.

In summary, there is no difference in Army or Navy ROTC enrollment potential by type of program (Scholarship/Non-scholarship) or by sex of respondent. Either program appears to possess equivalent interest to members of both sexes. But in the case of Air Force ROTC, there may be important differences in enrollment potential by program (Scholarship preferred over Non-scholarship) and by sex (higher male enrollment potential than female enrollment potential). No significant changes in enrollment potential were noted from 1972 to 1973.

ENROLLMENT POTENTIAL FOR OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

Each respondent also read a brief, standardized description of the Navy Reserve Officers Candidate program (ROC), the Navy Aviation Reserve Officers Candidate program (AVROC), and the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class (PLC). In considering AVROC, each respondent was asked to evaluate the AVROC Pilot and AVROC Navigator programs separately. In considering PLC, a distinction was made between PLC Ground, PLC Pilot and PLC Flight Officer programs. Table I-4 summarizes the extent of enrollment potential for these off-campus programs. Results are separately discussed for the PLC programs, and for the ROC/AVROC programs.

---

* Data on future applicant potential are presented for both men and women, although current program eligibility may be restricted on the basis of sex, i.e., women are reportedly ineligible for the PLC program at present. Should eligibility restrictions ease, the data on applicant potential will be relevant.

ENROLLMENT POTENTIAL FOR THE OFF-CAMPUS
MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

Percent Who Would Apply For:	MALES			FEMALES		
	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	Difference (%)	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	Difference (%)
PLC (Ground)	16.3	15.0	-1.3	16.8	15.6	-1.2
PLC Pilot	9.8	9.9	+ .1	4.7	4.4	- .3
PLC Flight Officer	8.3	9.6	+1.3	5.2	3.5	-1.7
ROC (Surface)	18.6	14.2	-4.4	14.0	14.3	+ .3
AVROC Pilot	12.0	11.4	- .6	6.2	6.9	+ .7
AVROC Navigator	11.3	10.0	-1.3	7.5	4.6	-2.9

TABLE I-4

PLC PROGRAMS.

For males in the 1973 survey, 15% reported applicant potential for the PLC-Ground program, while the rates for the PLC-Pilot program and PLC-Flight Officer program were both about 10%. For females in the 1973 survey, almost 16% reported applicant potential for the PLC-Ground program, while rates of 4% were observed for both the PLC-Pilot and PLC-Flight Officer programs.

The PLC-Ground program appealed to more respondents in each survey than did the PLC-Pilot or PLC-Flight Officer programs.

There was no sex difference in enrollment potential for the PLC-Ground program in either survey. However, the difference in Pilot/Flight Officer enrollment potential between the sexes is significant in both surveys, i.e., rates of about 8% to 10% for the men, compared to rates of 4% to 5% for the women.

ROC/AVROC PROGRAMS.

For males in 1973, the rate of applicant potential for ROC was 14%, while the rates for the AVROC-Pilot program and AVROC-Navigator program were 11% and 10%, respectively. For females in 1973, the rate of applicant potential for the ROC program was 14% (the same as the rate for men). Female applicant potential rates for the AVROC-Pilot program (7%) and AVROC-Navigator program (5%) were observed.

The ROC (Surface) program appealed to more respondents in each survey than did the AVROC-Pilot or AVROC-Navigator programs. (However, the difference was statistically significant in both 1972 and 1973 only for females.)

While there was no sex difference in enrollment potential for the ROC program, males were consistently more likely than females to indicate enrollment potential for the AVROC programs. This finding was noted in each survey, and the difference was significant in several instances, e.g., AVROC-Pilot in 1972 (12% - males; 6% - females); and AVROC-Navigator in 1973 (10% - males; 5% - females).

These results, taken in conjunction with the previous results for PLC enrollment potential, suggest that:

(1) The appeal for Ground (Surface) programs tends to exceed the appeal of flight (Pilot/Navigator) programs; and

(2) Men are more likely to be attracted to flight (Pilot/Navigator) programs than women.

RELATIVE PREFERENCE FOR THE PROGRAMS

After considering each ROTC program and each off-campus military officer training program, respondents were provided with a single list which included the title of each program. They were instructed to indicate which program interested them the most. The response "none of these (programs)" was a permissable option. The query elicited an relative preference for each military officer training program, or for none of the programs. Table I-5 presents data on the preference of each of the programs, controlling on sex of the respondent.

In 1973, 64% of the males expressed a preference for one of the programs, while 36% were not interested in any of the programs. Among women in the 1973 survey, 49% expressed a program preference, while 51% were not interested in any of the programs. In each survey, significantly more men than women expressed an interest in one of the programs.

MOST PREFERRED PROGRAM FROM AMONG SELECTED MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

Percent Who Prefer Each Program:	MALES			FEMALES		
	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	Difference (%)	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	Difference (%)
Army 4-year ROTC Scholarship	7.2	7.5	+ .3	5.2	5.2	0
Navy 4-year ROTC Scholarship	9.0	7.6	-1.4	6.6	7.3	+ .7
Air Force 4-year ROTC Scholarship	12.4	12.0	- .4	8.4	8.5	+ .1
Army ROTC Non-scholarship, serving 2 yrs	8.0	6.3	-1.7	8.4	7.4	-1.0
Navy ROTC Non-scholarship, serving 3 yrs	4.3	5.4	+1.1	4.5	4.1	- .4
Air Force ROTC Non-scholarship, serving 4 yrs	4.8	5.4	+ .6	1.7	3.5	+1.8
Marine Corps Off-Campus PLC Program	4.1	5.2	+1.1	6.3	2.5	-3.8
Navy Off-Campus ROC Program	4.5	7.1	+2.6	2.2	5.6	+3.4
Navy Off-Campus AVROC (Pilot)	4.4	5.2	+ .8	2.4	4.1	+1.7
Navy Off-Campus AVROC (Navigator)	1.2	2.2	+1.0	1.5	0.8	- .7
None of these	40.1	36.2	-3.9	52.7	50.9	-1.8
	100.0	100.1		99.9	99.9	

TABLE I-5

The Air Force ROTC Scholarship program which was most preferred by respondents in 1972 was also the most frequently selected program in 1973. The level of endorsement of this program was equivalent across surveys. Approximately 12% of the males and 8-9% of the female respondents in both surveys expressed a preference for the USAF ROTC Scholarship program.

Among males, the second most preferred program in both surveys was the Navy ROTC Scholarship program (8-9%). Female respondents in both surveys endorsed the 2-year Army Non-scholarship program as their second most preferred program (7-8%). In the 1973 survey, Navy ROC program received a higher level of endorsement among both men and women than it had in the 1972 survey. However, there were no changes in preference from 1972 to 1973 which were statistically significant.

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

It is useful to compare expressed interest in one of the college-based military officer training programs, and initial willingness to accept a military officer scholarship. Table I-6 represents a comparative summary and appraisal of military officer training program enrollment potential. In both surveys, little correspondence existed between (a) expressing a willingness to accept a military officer scholarship; and (b) expressing a preference for one of the various military officer training programs. This discrepancy may result from an inflation of responses favorable toward application for ROTC and off-campus programs; i.e., after being given a description of the programs many of the respondents may have found these programs attractive and expressed an

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY AND APPRAISAL OF ENROLLMENT POTENTIAL

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

	MALES		FEMALES	
	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	1972 (%)	1973 (%)
Express a willingness to attend college on a military officer scholarship	28.2	28.1	15.0	17.5
Express a preference for at least one Military Officer Training Program	59.9	63.9	47.2	49.0

TABLE I-6

interest in one of the programs. Hence, the high level of favorable attitudes toward one of the programs (64% - male; 49% - female) which was observed, in contrast to the lower level of initial willingness to attend college on a military officer scholarship (28% - male; 18% - female). It was earlier noted that there was also a major discrepancy between the reported behavior of applying for, or expecting to receive an ROTC scholarship (7% - male; 4% - female), in contrast to the expressed willingness to attend college on a military officer scholarship (Table I-1b and Table I-2). These differences suggest:

(1) a possible lack of awareness of these programs among young; and/or

(2) a possible discrepancy between interest in the programs and willingness to accept (or apply for) one of the scholarships.

Data are presented in Section IV which tend to substantiate the first hypothesis. Data are presented in Section III which lend some support to the second hypothesis. Pending the performance of more definitive research and analyses, the May 1973 data suggest that a relatively steady source of potential applicants may exist for college-based military officer training programs among high school seniors, and that enrollment potential for these programs has not decreased with the advent of the zero-draft environment.

II. DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF POTENTIAL APPLICANTS TO MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Demographic analyses were performed to determine if the various college-based military officer training programs appeal to different segments of the college-bound high school senior population. The analyses were done separately for each of the twelve programs appraised in both the 1972 and 1973 surveys. The programs are:

(1) ROTC Scholarship programs sponsored by the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

(2) ROTC Non-scholarship programs sponsored by the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

(3) The Marine Corps-sponsored PLC Ground, PLC Pilot and PLC Navigator programs; and

(4) The Navy-sponsored ROC program, AVROC-Pilot program, and AVROC-Navigator program.

The following demographic variables were evaluated: age, race, annual family income, current employment status, type of neighborhood (city size), and geographic region. The demographic data were analyzed for their relationship to enrollment potential, controlling on the sex of the respondent.

SAMPLE COMPARABILITY

Prior to evaluating the relationship of the demographic items to enrollment potential, the distribution of responses to each demographic item in both surveys was obtained. These distributions were then analyzed to determine the comparability of the 1972 and 1973 samples. Appendix C contains data on the demographic composition of the two surveys in weighted form.

Relative to 1972 data, differences were observed in the 1973 survey on the following demographic characteristics:

(1) Age (1973 respondents were younger);

(2) Annual family income (1973 males reported higher income*; 1973 females had a higher refusal rate);

(3) Employment status (fewer 1973 males and females were employed full-time); and

(4) type of neighborhood (fewer 1973 males were from small metropolitan areas).

There were no significant differences between the 1972 and 1973 samples on either race or the geographic region of residence. (However, this latter finding is an artifact of the weighting process, i.e., the sample data from each survey were weighted to conform to the same population distribution, by geographic region).

DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSES

Differences in enrollment potential among various demographic categories (i.e, white, non-white, resident of the South, etc.) were analyzed**. In these analyses, rates of applicant potential (by sex) for each demographic category were selectively compared to rates of applicant potential for the total sample of men or the total sample of women, as appropriate. The results will assist the reader in evaluating

---

*The report of higher family income in 1973 than in 1972 might, in part, represent a legitimate increase in the earnings of the parents of college-bound youth from 1972 to 1973.

**No tests were made of differences based on employment status since few youth were employed full-time (See Appendix C).

the potential feasibility of efforts to recruit in various segments of the youth population, as opposed to appealing to the total, college-bound populations of men or women (see the section entitled Technical Details at the end of this chapter for details of the analyses).

ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Table II-1 presents demographic data on male potential applicants to the ROTC Scholarship programs in 1972 and 1973.

In general, there were few differences in enrollment potential by demographic category which were consistent between the 1972 and 1973 surveys. The only noticeable exception was a higher applicant potential rate for Air Force ROTC among residents of non-metropolitan areas, compared to male respondents in general. This finding occurred in both surveys, and the differences were statistically significant for the two surveys in combination.

The 1973 survey data suggested certain promising market segments not noted in 1972. Included was the finding of higher Army ROTC applicant potential and Navy ROTC applicant potential among youth from families with incomes of between $8,000 to $14,000 per annum. Youth from families with incomes less than $8,000 also had a higher Army ROTC potential rate, but the difference was not statistically significant.

Some differences between total sample and demographic category which appear to be large involve demographic categories with only a few cases. For example, data from Table II-1 indicate that the proportion of youth from lower income families (less than $8,000 total family income per annum) who express applicant potential for the Army ROTC program in 1973 (25.0%) is similar to the proportion of potential applicants to Army ROTC from the middle income range of $8,000-$14,000 (26.1%). However, the former group did not have an applicant rate

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE

ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: MALE College-Bound High School Students

	1972 SURVEY			1973 SURVEY		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	11.8	16.6	18.4	13.4	15.4	19.2
Age						
17 years or younger	12.3	17.2	19.0	12.0	15.8	19.6
18 years or older	11.4	16.2	18.0	15.7	14.7	18.6
Race						
White	11.2	15.6	16.4	12.6	15.5	20.2
Black) Non-white	14.2	21.7	28.1	19.9	13.9	11.4
Other)						
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	14.6	24.2	28.1	25.0	6.0	13.1
$8,000-$13,999	10.8	18.5	23.1	26.1	23.9	23.0
$14,000-$19,999	11.4	12.0	14.4	13.9	19.7	23.6
$20,000 or over	8.1	9.5	15.2	7.9	13.2	17.6
Refused/Don't know	14.3	20.5	14.9	9.9	12.3	17.6
Employment Status						
Full time	11.7	12.3	24.0	6.9	27.6	12.6
Part-time	13.0	19.1	18.8	14.6	14.8	22.2
Not employed	10.3	15.0	15.9	12.3	14.1	14.3
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	8.5	15.9	14.4	11.8	19.5	21.0
Small Metropolitan	13.0	18.3	18.3	14.1	14.1	15.7
Non-metropolitan	14.5	13.7	26.2	15.3	10.5	23.1
Geographic Region						
Northeast	20.6	19.3	17.5	15.9	14.1	24.1
North Central	10.5	14.0	14.8	13.8	9.8	17.8
South	7.4	18.5	24.4	14.2	19.9	15.9
West	10.7	14.3	14.3	8.6	16.7	21.8

TABLE II-1

which was significantly different from the rate for the male population in total (13.4%), while the rate for youth from the middle income families did differ significantly from the rate for male youth in total ($p < .001$). Almost 16% of male youth are in the middle income category, while less than 6% of the male sample belong to the lower income category (see Appendix C). Therefore, the fact that the applicant rate for lower income male youth was not significantly different from the rate for the total sample was due, in part, to the small sample size of the lower income group.

In addition, some differences which appear substantial in 1973 are reversed in direction from 1972 to 1973 suggesting chance variations, e.g., low AFROTC potential among non-white youth in 1973 (11.4%) but high AFROTC potential among the same segment in 1972 (28.1%). See Table II-1.

Table II-2 presents demographic data on applicant potential for ROTC Scholarship programs among female college-bound high school seniors. In each survey, significantly higher rates of applicant potential for AFROTC were found among women from families with incomes under $8,000 per annum, compared to women in general. Also, non-white women in each survey showed higher applicant rates for the Army ROTC scholarship program than did women in general. (The differences were statistically significant for 1972, and for the two surveys in combination.) Finally, some consistent differences in program appeal based on geographic region were observed:

(1) Significantly higher potential for Army ROTC among residents of the South (significant in 1972 and 1973);

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: FEMALE College-Bound High School Students

	1972 SURVEY			1973 SURVEY		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	10.3	17.2	15.4	13.5	16.6	14.0
Age						
17 years or younger	11.4	18.1	17.9	13.7	17.6	14.8
18 years or older	9.4	16.2	12.9	13.0	15.0	12.4
Race						
White	8.8	17.0	14.4	12.1	16.1	14.1
Black) Non-white Other)	16.7	18.1	19.6	20.3	15.1	13.4
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	17.6	18.7	24.6	11.0	19.1	27.2
$8,000-$13,999	7.0	19.5	10.9	16.3	10.2	14.4
$14,000-$19,999	14.8	17.6	14.4	7.3	15.1	11.9
$20,000 or over	5.9	16.2	15.2	12.4	17.6	6.2
Refused/Don't know	8.6	18.6	15.0	15.4	18.6	14.0
Employment Status						
Full time	3.9	5.8	5.8	15.6	15.6	
Part-time	11.2	19.2	14.8	16.0	17.2	14.2
Not employed	10.4	16.9	17.4	10.5	16.0	14.6
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	8.6	15.7	14.4	11.2	18.4	15.0
Small Metropolitan	10.2	18.6	14.7	15.8	16.3	13.1
Non-metropolitan	14.0	15.7	18.8	10.0	13.7	13.3
Geographic Region						
Northeast	3.4	11.2	8.7	8.9	19.7	8.9
North Central	7.6	27.9	17.5	11.2	22.5	14.1
South	15.7	14.3	20.4	19.7	10.0	16.7
West	13.2	14.0	11.3	11.3	16.0	15.6

TABLE II-2

(2) Higher potential for Navy ROTC among residents of the North Central region (significant in 1972 and for both years in combination); and

(3) Significantly lower potential for Army ROTC and Air Force ROTC among residents of the Northeast (significant for 1972 and for both years in combination).

In addition, in 1973 a significantly lower applicant rate for the Navy ROTC Scholarship program was found for women who resided in the South compared to women in general.

ROTC NON-SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Table II-3 presents demographic data on applicant potential for ROTC Non-scholarship programs among male college-bound high school seniors. There were only a few consistent differences in program appeal based on demographic correlates from 1972 to 1973. Non-white males showed higher applicant potential for the Army ROTC Non-scholarship programs than did men in general. (Results were significant for 1972, and for both years in combination.)

Youth from families with incomes under $8,000 per year reported higher rates of applicant potential for the Air Force Non-scholarship program than did men in general. (Results were significant for 1972, and for both years in combination.) Youth from families with incomes in excess of $20,000 showed a significantly lower applicant rate for the AFROTC program than the male population at large. (Differences were statistically significant for both years in combination.) In the 1973 survey, men from families in the middle income range ($8,000-$14,000) were more likely to indicate enrollment potential for Army ROTC than men in general.

Finally, residents of non-metropolitan areas had lower rates of applicant potential for the Navy ROTC Non-scholarship program than did men in general.

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE

ROTC NON-SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Base: MALE College-Bound High School Students

	1972 SURVEY			1973 SURVEY		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	14.8	14.9	15.8	12.5	16.0	14.7
Age						
17 years or younger	11.6	16.4	13.3	10.8	17.1	11.6
18 years or older	17.1	13.8	17.8	15.2	14.3	19.3
Race						
White	13.3	14.5	13.7	11.8	16.7	14.7
Black) Non-white	22.1	17.0	26.5	18.1	10.2	15.1
Other)						
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	17.4	24.7	29.8	17.9	7.1	19.0
$8,000-$13,999	15.4	14.8	15.4	23.0	24.8	14.4
$14,000-$19,999	11.0	12.0	14.7	11.2	11.6	18.1
$20,000 or over	13.8	7.8	9.2	8.2	15.4	10.9
Refused/Don't know	16.8	18.1	15.4	11.0	16.6	15.5
Employment Status						
Full time	15.1	7.3	17.9	16.1	36.8	--
Part-time	16.3	17.7	16.7	13.2	16.0	17.4
Not employed	12.8	13.4	14.2	10.3	11.9	12.1
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	13.1	16.2	12.2	11.6	23.6	14.7
Small Metropolitan	16.4	15.6	17.9	10.7	11.9	14.6
Non-metropolitan	13.3	10.7	16.9	17.7	10.5	15.0
Geographic Region						
Northeast	19.9	19.3	16.9	11.9	15.9	14.1
North Central	12.5	11.3	14.0	10.9	9.8	13.8
South	14.7	16.2	20.0	14.2	18.0	13.1
West	11.5	12.7	9.9	12.5	21.0	19.1

TABLE II-3

(Differences were statistically significant for both years in combination.) Residents of larger metropolitan areas had significantly higher applicant potential for the NROTC Non-scholarship program in the 1973 survey.

Table II-4 presents demographic data on applicant potential for ROTC Non-scholarship programs among female college-bound high school seniors. Again, few consistent substantial demographic relationships were observed. However, female high school seniors from the North Central region showed a higher potential applicant rate for the Navy ROTC program than did women in general. Lower applicant rates for the Army ROTC program were noted when comparing female residents of the Northeast to females in general. In each case, results were statistically significant for 1972 and for both surveys in combination.

In the 1973 survey, higher applicant potential for the USAF ROTC Non-scholarship program was noted among women from families with incomes under $8,000 per annum, compared to women in general.

Higher rates of applicant potential for the Army ROTC Non-scholarship program was reported by non-white females in 1973, in comparison with the total 1973 female sample. Higher rates of applicant potential for the Navy ROTC program were found among non-whites in 1972 and 1973, with results statistically significant for both surveys in combination.

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF POTENTIAL APPLICANTS TO OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

The applicant potential for off-campus officer training programs was also examined. Table II-5 presents demographic data on the applicant potential of male college-bound high school seniors for the various Marine Corps PLC programs. The PLC Ground program showed the only consistent demographic correlate of applicant potential. In 1973, higher applicant potential for this program was found among youth from families with incomes from $8,000-$14,000 per annum (27.5%), compared to men in general.

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE

ROTC NON-SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Base: FEMALE College-Bound High School Students

	1972 SURVEY			1973 SURVEY		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	14.9	14.4	8.6	14.7	15.2	11.0
Age						
17 years or younger	15.9	17.2	8.8	16.0	14.3	12.1
18 years or older	13.8	11.5	8.4	12.4	17.0	9.0
Race						
White	14.7	13.5	8.4	12.7	14.1	10.9
Black) Non-white	15.6	18.1	9.6	25.1	21.2	11.3
Other)						
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	17.1	15.0	13.9	16.9	19.1	23.5
$8,000-$13,999	18.0	14.5	7.8	21.9	8.4	9.3
$14,000-$19,999	19.0	14.4	9.9	7.3	7.8	6.9
$20,000 or over	11.8	10.3	11.8	15.5	9.8	7.3
Refused/Don't know	11.4	15.8	5.2	14.0	20.8	11.5
Employment Status						
Full time	-	1.9	7.8	6.3	25.0	-
Part-time	15.4	16.3	7.9	16.5	15.7	10.5
Not employed	16.6	14.4	9.5	12.9	14.1	12.1
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	13.2	13.1	8.4	13.1	18.0	11.9
Small Metropolitan	12.6	17.3	9.3	17.0	15.5	9.5
Non-metropolitan	23.2	10.3	7.7	12.5	9.2	12.2
Geographic Region						
Northeast	6.2	7.8	6.8	10.8	14.2	10.8
North Central	16.7	21.1	6.8	18.3	19.8	8.4
South	17.2	14.9	11.9	17.1	12.6	13.4
West	18.7	11.3	7.4	9.8	14.8	10.5

TABLE II-4

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS: PLC

Base: MALE College-Bound High School Students

	1972 SURVEY			1973 SURVEY		
	Ground	Pilot	FLO	Ground	Pilot	FLO
Total Sample	16.3	9.8	8.3	15.0	9.9	9.6
Age						
17 years or younger	15.5	14.1	9.2	15.5	9.8	9.0
18 years or older	17.0	6.8	7.7	14.2	9.9	10.4
Race						
White	15.8	10.0	7.3	15.5	10.6	8.7
Black) Non-white						
Other)	19.0	8.7	13.4	10.8	4.2	10.8
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	24.2	6.2	14.0	19.0	6.0	3.6
$8,000-$13,999	17.0	10.8	7.1	27.5	14.9	5.4
$14,000-$19,999	13.4	11.4	8.4	8.9	8.5	10.4
$20,000 or over	11.0	5.7	4.6	13.6	6.9	10.7
Refused/Don't know	18.6	13.0	9.7	12.7	11.8	9.2
Employment Status						
Full time	11.2	14.5	10.1	24.1	13.8	16.1
Part-time	18.1	10.5	9.4	17.8	10.9	9.6
Not employed	15.5	7.4	6.2	7.6	7.2	8.5
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	18.1	10.9	7.4	17.3	12.9	14.4
Small Metropolitan	16.3	7.0	8.0	12.1	6.5	3.2
Non-metropolitan	13.7	16.5	10.9	17.0	11.2	13.6
Geographic Region						
Northeast	12.3	7.7	6.4	18.1	10.0	14.1
North Central	15.5	10.5	4.3	11.7	8.8	5.8
South	20.6	11.1	11.8	16.3	9.6	10.3
West	15.1	9.1	10.7	13.2	12.1	8.6

TABLE II-5

Table II-6 presents demographic data on the appeal of Marine Corps PLC programs for female college-bound high school seniors. In both surveys, there was higher applicant potential for the PLC-Ground program among non-whites, compared to women in general. Also in both surveys there was higher appeal for the PLC-Ground program among women from families with incomes under $8,000 per annum compared to women in general. In each case, results were statistically significant for both surveys in combination.

Table II-7 shows the demographic correlates of applicant potential for the ROC/AVROC programs among male, college-bound seniors. There was a difference in the appeal of the AVROC programs by race in terms of applicant potential for navigator training and pilot training. Non-whites showed higher applicant potential for navigator training than men in general, and lower applicant potential for pilot training than men in general. In each case, results were statistically significant for both surveys in combination.

For the ROC program a higher appeal was demonstrated in 1973 by men from families with annual incomes between $8,000 and $14,000 per annum (28.4%) than by men in general (14.2%).

Table II-8 presents demographic data on applicant potential for the ROC/AVROC programs among female college-bound high school seniors. There were few consistent demographic correlates of applicant potential noted. However, in both surveys, higher applicant potential for the ROC program was noted among non-whites than among women in general. Results were statistically significant for 1973, and for both surveys in combination.

SUMMARY

The search for consistent demographic correlates of applicant potential has not proven very successful. Only a few exceptions are noted:

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS: PLC

Base: FEMALE College-Bound High School Students

	1972 SURVEY			1973 SURVEY		
	Ground	Pilot	FLO	Ground	Pilot	FLO
Total Sample	16.8	4.7	5.2	15.6	4.4	3.5
Age						
17 years or younger	19.9	6.4	6.6	16.3	4.4	4.5
18 years or older	13.6	3.1	3.9	14.2	4.4	1.6
Race						
White	15.3	5.0	4.1	14.5	4.6	3.1
Black) Non-white	23.0	3.7	10.0	21.2	-	2.3
Other)						
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	20.9	7.0	12.3	25.7	6.6	6.6
$8,000-$13,999	17.6	3.1	4.3	12.6	3.3	1.9
$14,000-$19,999	17.6	6.7	4.6	19.3	1.8	2.8
$20,000 or over	12.3	4.9	3.4	9.3	1.0	4.1
Refused/Don't know	16.4	3.6	4.2	15.1	6.2	3.5
Employment Status						
Full time	7.8	-	-	-	15.6	-
Part-time	15.9	5.5	6.6	16.8	5.2	3.7
Not employed	19.1	4.7	4.8	14.9	2.9	3.7
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	17.5	5.0	5.0	16.8	3.5	3.8
Small Metropolitan	16.8	5.0	5.3	14.3	6.0	3.6
Non-metropolitan	15.5	4.1	5.9	15.9	3.0	3.0
Geographic Region						
Northeast	13.0	3.4	4.3	14.2	3.7	5.2
North Central	22.7	3.1	1.6	17.0	5.7	1.3
South	14.9	7.0	10.2	14.5	4.1	3.7
West	16.0	4.7	2.7	16.8	4.3	4.3

TABLE II-6

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS: ROC/AVROC

Base: MALE College-Bound High School Students

	1972 SURVEY			1973 SURVEY		
	ROC	AVROC-PILOT	AVROC-NAV	ROC	AVROC-PILOT	AVROC-NAV
Total Sample	18.6	12.0	11.3	14.2	11.4	10.0
Age						
17 years or younger	17.8	12.4	7.5	14.0	10.6	9.1
18 years or older	15.1	10.1	12.1	14.7	12.4	11.5
Race						
White	18.6	13.1	10.2	14.7	12.1	8.7
Black) Non-white	19.0	6.7	17.0	10.8	6.0	15.1
Other)						
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	25.3	12.9	15.7	22.6	9.5	3.6
$8,000-$13,999	19.1	13.6	14.2	28.4	13.5	14.9
$14,000-$19,999	15.1	10.7	11.4	8.5	10.0	8.1
$20,000 or over	15.2	8.8	7.8	8.9	13.1	8.2
Refused/Don't know	20.5	13.5	9.7	13.5	10.1	11.8
Employment Status						
Full time	15.1	9.5	8.4	21.8	17.2	3.4
Part-time	22.1	12.2	11.7	18.2	12.2	10.8
Not employed	15.0	12.6	12.0	4.7	8.5	10.1
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	16.8	13.5	7.6	15.5	13.4	14.2
Small Metropolitan	19.9	10.4	14.2	12.9	9.2	5.5
Non-metropolitan	18.1	14.1	10.5	15.0	11.6	11.6
Geographic Region						
Northeast	21.8	12.9	12.9	18.1	14.3	14.1
North Central	14.8	16.0	10.5	10.9	8.6	5.8
South	22.1	8.8	11.8	14.2	11.3	11.3
West	14.3	9.9	9.9	14.8	13.2	8.9

TABLE II-7

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE

OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS: ROC/AVROC

Base: FEMALE College-Bound High School Students

	1972 SURVEY			1973 SURVEY		
	ROC	AVROC-PILOT	AVROC-NAV	ROC	AVROC-PILOT	AVROC-NAV
Total Sample	14.0	6.2	7.5	14.3	6.9	4.6
Age						
17 years or younger	16.6	9.1	9.3	13.5	9.3	5.4
18 years or older	11.3	3.5	5.6	15.8	2.8	3.0
Race						
White	12.8	6.5	7.8	12.6	6.6	3.4
Black) Non-white	18.9	5.2	6.3	22.5	8.7	-
Other)						
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	17.6	7.5	15.0	20.6	10.3	6.6
$8,000-$13,999	19.5	8.6	7.8	6.5	11.2	5.1
$14,000-$19,999	11.3	5.6	6.0	8.7	7.3	3.7
$20,000 or over	10.8	9.3	7.4	16.1	6.2	5.2
Refused/Don't know	12.6	3.6	5.6	17.0	5.0	3.9
Employment Status						
Full time	-	-	8.7	-	-	15.6
Part-time	12.0	5.5	5.4	14.7	6.9	2.8
Not employed	18.2	7.9	9.4	14.6	7.3	6.2
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	10.8	7.3	6.3	14.7	5.2	5.9
Small Metropolitan	15.7	5.6	7.5	15.3	9.3	3.6
Non-metropolitan	17.0	5.9	10.0	11.1	5.5	3.7
Geographic Region						
Northeast	7.8	1.9	5.3	16.0	3.7	5.2
North Central	15.9	9.1	9.9	14.1	7.0	4.2
South	16.6	7.9	10.2	14.5	7.4	5.2
West	14.0	4.7	1.9	12.1	10.5	2.7

TABLE II-8

(1) higher program appeal among male youth from middle income families, generally for Army ROTC programs and for the "Ground/Surface" off-campus programs (ROC) and PLC-Ground; and

(2) higher program appeal among non-white females, generally for Army ROTC programs or for "Ground/Surface" programs such as the PLC-Ground program and ROC program.

There is some indication of differential appeal by geographic region for females, and by city size (type of neighborhood) among males. For example, the Navy ROTC programs were preferred by female residents of the North Central United States, while Northeastern residents expressed a significantly lower Army ROTC potential than females in general. Among males, residents of non-metropolitan areas expressed a higher applicant rate for the Air Force ROTC Scholarship program and a lower applicant rate for the Navy ROTC Non-scholarship program compared to male youth in general.

Because there were few major consistent differences in applicant potential rates across demographic categories, it appears useful to consider correlates of enrollment potential other than demographic characteristics. Section III presents data on various reasons for applying some of which appear promising in the recruitment of potential applicants.

TECHNICAL DETAILS

Differences between the applicant rate for each demographic category and the overall applicant rate for the total sample were computed. Following these computations, certain differences between applicant rates were selected for further statistical analyses. Two decision rules were used to select differences for statistical testing

The rules were based on evidence of:

(1) substantial differences in the most recent (1973) survey; and/or

(2) consistent differences based on both surveys (1972 and 1973)

The specific decision rules used for selecting which of the differences would be subjected to the analyses were as follows:

(1) Differences between the applicant potential rate for a particular demographic category and the applicant potential rate for the total sample in 1973 had to be greater than 7%. In addition, the difference between the applicant rate for this demographic category and the total sample had to be in the same direction (positive or negative) in 1972 as the difference between the 1973 applicant rates; or

(2) Differences between the applicant potential rate for a particular demographic category and the applicant potential rate for the total sample had to be greater than 4% in 1973 and greater than 5% in 1972, with the difference in the same direction in both 1972 and 1973.

Estimates of the statistical significance of differences between applicant rates for the total sample and the demographic sub-category were computed. The analyses involved the assumption that the rate of applicant potential for the total sample could be considered a population estimate (with no error), and compared to the rate of applicant potential for each demographic category, with the latter considered to be sample estimates. A standard formula was employed (Walker & Lev, 1953, p. 37). Finally, the findings of significance tests for 1972 and 1973 were combined, using the Stouffer approach, as discussed by Mosteller and Bush in Lindzey (1954, p. 329). This procedure was used to determine if consistent demographic relationships existed between the two surveys of sufficient size, such that significant differences were attained for the two surveys, if not for each survey taken singly.

To be reported, differences in enrollment potential between a demographic segment and the total sample had to achieve statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level for 1973 only, or for both years when results of the tests on the 1972 data and the 1973 data were combined using the Stouffer approach.

III. REASONS FOR MILITARY AFFILIATION

The endorsement of a series of general and specific reasons for application to college-based military officer training programs was studied in 1973 and 1972. Comparisons were made of the extent of endorsement of each reason between the two surveys, separately for male and female respondents in total.

The importance of both reasons in relation to applicant potential was also determined. Approximate tests of statistical significance were performed to compare the extent of endorsement of each reason among respondents in general and among a subset of respondents consisting of only potential applicants to each ROTC program.* These comparisons were made controlling on sex. For each survey, observed differences in the rate of attributing strong influence to each reason were compared for the potential male applicants and for men in general. Similar comparisons were done for female applicants and women in general.** The analyses were done to determine which reasons were most important to the subsample of respondents classified as potential applicants compared to the total population of male and female youth. Identification of differences between the population in total and the subsample of potential applicants could be useful in developing more relevant themes and appeals for use in future ROTC advertising and recruiting programs.

---

* The 1972 and 1973 data are analyzed in the same way and the results may be compared. Data from the 1972 survey were previously reported in an alternative manner (fisher and Harford, 1972). The present analysis is more meaningful.

** Appendix A contains the table of sample tolerances used in these analyses. Also see the section entitled Technical Details at the end of this chapter for details of the analysis.

GENERAL REASONS FOR APPLYING FOR OFFICER TRAINING

Each respondent was asked to review the following general reasons for applying for military officer training, and to indicate whether each reason would influence his/her decision to apply.

GENERAL REASONS FOR APPLYING FOR OFFICER TRAINING

1. Military career opportunities
2. Travel, adventure, and new experiences
3. Serve my country
4. Opportunity for further academic education
5. Qualify for GI Bill benefits
6. Pay and allowances
7. Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.
8. Avoid being drafted
9. Become more mature
10. Status and prestige of being an officer
11. Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job
12. Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice
13. Opportunity for special professional/technical training

Table III-1 presents the results of analyses for college-bound high school seniors in total in 1972 and 1973.

In 1973, approximately 47% of male respondents and 50% of female respondents attributed strong influence to the opportunity for "travel, adventure, and new experiences" in their decision to apply for military

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GENERAL REASONS ATTRIBUTED STRONG INFLUENCE IN THE DECISION TO APPLY FOR MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING

Base: College-Bound High School Students

General Reasons	MALES 1972 (%)	MALES 1973 (%)	FEMALES 1972 (%)	FEMALES 1973 (%)
Military career opportunities	18.8	23.5	15.9	19.4
Travel, adventure and new experiences	38.2	46.7	43.2	49.8
Serve my country	22.2	22.5	21.8	18.2
Opportunity for further academic education	27.0	31.5	25.7	35.1
Qualify for G.I. Bill benefits	22.4	22.3	14.0	18.7
Pay and allowances	22.6	25.3	18.3	22.7
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.	26.3	28.1	22.8	27.2
Avoid being drafted	23.0	19.7	12.2	7.3
Become more mature	18.6	17.4	18.6	17.2
Status and prestige of being an officer	12.7	12.6	7.2	9.1
Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job	15.0	16.4	14.4	14.0
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice	19.8	13.8	9.1	9.2
Opportunity for special professional/technical training	30.7	38.0	27.8	35.6

TABLE III-1

officer training. This was the most frequently endorsed reason for both men and women in both 1972 and 1973. For the men, the 1973 level of endorsement (47%) represents a significant increase over the level of endorsement found in the 1972 survey (38%). Another highly endorsed reason which also showed a significant increase in endorsement between 1972 and 1973 for both men and women was the "opportunity for special professional/technical training".

Other reasons which were accorded influence in the decision to apply for military officer training by over 24% of the men and 19% of the women in 1973 included:

(1) Opportunity for further academic education;

(2) Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc;

(3) Pay and allowances; and

(4) Military career opportunities.

Comparing 1972 and 1973 results, it was found that each of these reasons appeared to elicit higher rates of endorsement in 1973 than in 1972. However, the majority of these increases did not achieve statistical significance between survey administrations. The only exception occurred for female respondents in the 1973 survey who endorsed the "opportunity for further academic education" more frequently than female respondents in the 1972 survey.

Among males, there was a significant decline from 1972 to 1973 in endorsement of the reason "fulfilling my military obligation at the time of my choice". The only other reason which showed an apparent decline in influence between surveys was "to avoid the draft". This finding would be expected, since the draft was suspended in January 1973. However, the decline from 1972 to 1973 in endorsement of the reason "to avoid the draft" was not statistically significant.

Further analyses were performed to determine which of these general reasons was most related to ROTC program affiliation. Table III-2 presents results for potential male applicants to the ROTC Scholarship programs in 1972 and 1973. For convenience, the level of endorsement of each reason among male respondents in total is also presented for both 1972 and 1973.

There was some consistency between the respondents in total and the potential applicant samples to each ROTC program in the selection of the general reasons accorded most influence. Both the total respondent population and the smaller potential ROTC applicant samples listed "travel, adventure, and new experiences" as a primary reason for enrollment. A second highly influential reason was "opportunity for special professional/technical training". Both reasons received higher levels of endorsement from potential applicants than from respondents in general. This finding occurred in both 1972 and 1973.

In reviewing the results by program (service), there were generally larger differences in endorsement between potential Army ROTC enrollees and men in general, as compared to potential enrollees to the Navy or Air Force and men in general. For example, potential Army ROTC Scholarship applicants in 1973 tended to endorse the following reasons more than male respondents in general:

(1) Military career opportunities;

(2) Serve my country;

(3) Opportunity for further academic education;

(4) Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc;

GENERAL REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: Male College-Bound High School Students

General Reasons	Potential Applicants: 1972 Survey				Potential Applicants: 1973 Survey			
	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	Total Males (%)	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	Total Males (%)
Military career opportunities	29.1	35.1	41.9	18.8	44.8	29.1	36.0	23.5
Travel, adventure and new experiences	53.5	54.5	61.8	38.2	67.2	59.1	60.7	46.7
Serve my country	23.3	29.3	32.2	22.2	35.9	28.6	32.7	22.5
Opportunity for further academic education	33.1	49.2	45.3	27.0	45.3	47.3	44.4	31.5
Qualify for G.I. Bill benefits	24.4	33.9	34.5	22.4	32.3	22.7	25.5	22.3
Pay and allowances	24.4	38.4	40.1	22.6	48.4	40.9	31.3	25.3
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.	32.0	40.5	44.2	26.3	40.6	38.6	37.5	28.1
Avoid being drafted	22.7	24.8	22.1	23.0	18.8	24.1	17.8	19.7
Become more mature	23.8	31.0	26.6	18.6	33.9	28.2	21.8	17.4
Status and prestige of being an officer	20.3	27.3	24.0	12.7	25.5	14.1	25.1	12.6
Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job	25.0	17.8	18.7	15.0	35.9	25.5	16.0	16.4
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice	35.5	40.1	29.6	19.8	19.3	19.1	14.2	13.8
Opportunity for special professional/technical training	40.1	57.4	44.9	30.7	60.9	59.5	54.5	38.0

TABLE III-2

(5) Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job;

(6) Status and prestige of being an officer; and

(7) Become more mature.

In the 1973 survey, "pay and allowances" was also cited as an influential reason more often by potential applicants to Army ROTC and to Navy ROTC, than by men in general.

There was a significant decrease from 1972 to 1973 in the extent of influence accorded "fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice" among potential applicants to each program.

Table III-3 presents findings on the extent of influence accorded each reason by potential female applicants to ROTC Scholarship programs and women in general. In both surveys, a higher percentage of potential women applicants to Army and Navy ROTC Scholarship programs accorded strong influence to the "opportunity for special professional/technical training" than did female respondents in general. The same finding was also noted for potential USAF ROTC applicants in the 1973 survey. In the 1973 survey, potential female applicants to each ROTC program also endorsed "benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.", and the "status and prestige of being an officer" at higher rates than did women in general. Potential female applicants to Navy and Air Force ROTC Scholarship programs in 1973 were more likely to endorse the "opportunity for further academic education" and "travel, adventure and new experiences" than were females in general. Also, potential female applicants to Army and Navy ROTC Scholarship programs in 1973 were more likely to endorse "pay and allowances" than were women in general.

GENERAL REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: Female College-bound High School Students

General Reasons	Potential Applicants: 1972 Survey				Potential Applicants: 1973 Survey			
	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	Total Females (%)	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	Total Females (%)
Military career opportunities	34.5	27.2	22.7	15.9	21.9	32.5	21.6	19.4
Travel, adventure and new experiences	59.5	63.4	5 .6	43.2	49.0	61.6	61.8	49.8
Serve my country	37.8	32.5	29.5	21.8	25.5	26.6	26.1	18.2
Opportunity for further academic education	34.5	28.0	27.7	25.7	44.8	53.6	49.7	35.1
Qualify for G.I. Bill benefits	11.5	20.3	16.8	14.0	25.0	29.1	24.1	18.7
Pay and allowances	23.6	28.9	16.8	18.3	35.4	32.9	29.6	22.7
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.	28.4	31.3	27.7	22.8	40.1	40.1	41.2	27.2
Avoid being drafted	15.5	10.6	5.0	12.2	7.8	7.6	7.0	7.3
Become more mature	29.1	24.4	30.5	18.6	40.1	26.2	26.1	17.2
Status and prestige of being an officer	14.9	10.2	5.0	7.2	29.2	17.3	23.6	9.7
Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job	12.2	13.8	13.2	14.4	24.0	17.3	17.6	14.0
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice	18.9	15.9	12.7	9.1	15.1	11.0	11.6	9.2
Opportunity for special professional/technical training	42.6	39.8	36.4	27.8	56.8	53.6	48.7	35.6

TABLE III-3

Finally, potential female applicants to the Army ROTC Scholarship program in 1973 were more likely to endorse the "difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job" and to "become more mature" as influences in the decision to apply for military officer training compared to women in general. The latter findings parallel results for potential male applicants to the ROTC Scholarship program presented above (see Table III-2).

Table III-4 presents findings on the endorsement of various reasons by male applicants to the ROTC Non-scholarship programs in contrast with men in general. In both surveys, potential male applicants to the Non-scholarship programs generally endorsed the "opportunity for special professional/technical training" more often than did male respondents in general.

Respondents in the 1973 survey who claimed they would apply to the Army ROTC Non-scholarship program accorded greater influence to many of the reasons compared to male respondents in general. For example, the following were endorsed more often by the potential Army ROTC Non-scholarship program applicants:

(1) Military career opportunities;

(2) Travel, adventure, and new experiences;

(3) Serving my country;

(4) Opportunity for further academic education;

(5) To qualify for G.I. Bill benefits;

(6) Pay and allowances;

(7) Become more mature;

GENERAL REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC NON-SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: Male College-Bound High School Students

General Reasons	Potential Applicants: 1972 Survey				Potential Applicants: 1973 Survey			
	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	Total Males (%)	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	Total Males (%)
Military career opportunities	26.5	39.4	35.2	18.8	44.1	33.2	36.7	23.5
Travel, adventure and new experiences	50.2	51.9	54.8	38.2	73.2	51.1	54.8	46.7
Serve my country	27.9	31.0	36.1	22.2	41.3	28.8	41.0	22.5
Opportunity for further academic education	40.9	41.7	43.0	27.0	55.9	49.8	39.0	31.5
Qualify for G.I. Bill benefits	29.8	30.6	33.0	22.4	34.6	27.9	27.1	22.3
Pay and allowances	28.8	32.9	38.3	22.6	40.2	31.4	32.4	25.3
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.	29.8	36.6	43.0	26.3	36.9	41.0	34.3	28.1
Avoid being drafted	26.5	24.5	21.7	23.0	12.8	19.7	15.7	19.7
Become more mature	29.3	28.2	30.4	18.6	35.8	27.5	21.4	17.4
Status and prestige of being an officer	20.0	26.4	21.3	12.7	32.4	19.2	25.7	12.6
Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job	22.3	15.3	16.5	15.0	35.2	21.8	20.5	16.4
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice	32.6	39.8	30.9	19.8	28.5	22.7	14.8	13.8
Opportunity for special professional/technical training	45.1	53.7	41.3	30.7	62.0	59.0	56.7	38.0

TABLE III-4

(8) Status and prestige of being an officer;

(9) Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job; and

(10) Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice.

Also, from 1972 to 1973, there was a decline in the extent of influence attributed to the reason "fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice" by potential male applicants to the Navy and Air Force ROTC Non-scholarship programs. The difference for the Army was not significant.

Table III-5 presents data on the extent of endorsement of these reasons by potential female applicants to ROTC Non-scholarship programs, and by women in general. In general, college-bound women in high school interested in the ROTC Non-scholarship programs tended to endorse the "opportunity for special professional/technical training" at a higher level than did female respondents in general. (The differences were significant in each case with the exception of Army ROTC applicants in 1972 versus women in general in 1972.)

In the 1973 survey, potential female applicants to each ROTC Non-scholarship program cited the "opportunity for further academic education" at a higher rate than women in general. In both surveys, applicants to the Navy and Air Force ROTC Non-scholarship programs endorsed "serving my country" at a higher rate than women in general.

In 1973, higher percentages of female potential applicants to the Navy ROTC Non-scholarship program accorded influence to "qualify for G.I. Bill benefits", "benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.", and "travel, adventure, and new experiences" as reasons for enrollment than did women in general.

GENERAL REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC NON-SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: Female College-Bound High School Students

General Reasons	Potential Applicants: 1972 Survey				Potential Applicants: 1973 Survey			
	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	Total Females (%)	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	Total Females (%)
Military career opportunities	33.8	22.3	35.8	15.9	25.4	27.6	24.2	19.4
Travel, adventure and new experiences	60.1	57.3	59.3	43.2	50.2	64.5	61.8	49.8
Serve my country	32.9	36.9	39.8	21.8	23.9	38.7	33.1	18.2
Opportunity for further academic education	33.8	35.4	25.2	25.7	47.4	57.6	52.2	35.1
Qualify for G.I. Bill benefits	20.7	18.9	18.7	14.0	23.9	31.3	28.7	18.7
Pay and allowances	24.9	23.8	17.1	18.3	31.1	27.6	24.8	22.7
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.	33.3	31.1	29.3	22.8	35.4	41.9	38.2	27.2
Avoid being drafted	19.2	10.7	4.9	12.2	8.6	8.3	7.6	7.3
Become more mature	37.1	24.8	35.0	18.6	33.5	24.0	21.7	17.2
Status and prestige of being an officer	9.4	7.3	12.2	7.2	21.1	17.5	18.5	9.1
Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job	15.5	15.0	16.3	14.4	23.0	15.2	11.5	14.0
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice	16.0	13.1	17.9	9.1	16.7	12.9	10.8	9.2
Opportunity for special professional/technical training	32.9	48.5	45.5	27.8	49.8	55.8	54.1	35.6

TABLE III-5

In summary, the attribution of strong influence to any one of the general reasons in the 1973 survey seemed to show some consistency regardless of the program type (Scholarship or Non-scholarship), the sponsor (Army, Navy, USAF), or the sex of the respondent. Compared to respondents in general, the reasons which were mentioned more frequently by the potential ROTC applicants included the "opportunity for special professional/technical training" and to a lesser extent, the "opportunity for further academic education".

However, some variability in the endorsement of the reasons was noted by program sponsor in that potential male applicants to Army ROTC programs were more likely to attribute influence to a variety of reasons, compared to men in general. Analogous findings were not obtained for potential applicants to programs sponsored by the other services.

SPECIFIC REASONS FOR APPLYING FOR OFFICER TRAINING

Each respondent was asked to review the following specific reasons for applying for college military officer training, and to indicate how strongly each reason would influence or had influenced the decision to apply for a college military officer training program.

SPECIFIC REASONS FOR APPLYING FOR OFFICER TRAINING

1. Which particular Service I am trained for (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps)
2. Whether I become an aviation officer (get to fly) or not
3. Whether I become a "ground" officer (do not get to fly) or not
4. How much money I get each month I'm in college (subsistence allowance)
5. If I get expense money for all 4 years of college
6. If I get expense money just for the last 2 years of college
7. If I have to go to summer camp
8. If my college tuition is paid (Scholarship program)
9. If I get to go to the college of my choice
10. If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income
11. If I have to go into the military service
12. If I have to take courses in military subjects in college
13. If I have to drill (march) on campus
14. How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college
15. How many years I have to serve in the Reserves after I complete active duty

Results for the total male and female sample from both surveys appear in Table III-6.

In both surveys, male and female college-bound high school seniors most frequently identified the following reasons as having a strong influence

SPECIFIC REASONS ATTRIBUTED STRONG INFLUENCE IN THE DECISION TO APPLY FOR A COLLEGE MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAM

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

Specific Considerations	MALES 1972 (%)	MALES 1973 (%)	FEMALES 1972 (%)	FEMALES 1973 (%)
Which particular Service I am trained for (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps)	22.2	27.0	20.8	22.2
Whether I become an aviation officer (get to fly) or not	13.0	18.0	7.7	10.7
Whether I become a "grouhd" officer (do not get to fly) or not	14.2	15.7	11.0	11.9
How much money I get each month I'm in college (subsistence allowance)	33.2	35.9	29.0	32.1
If I get expense money for all 4 years of college	36.8	42.0	36.8	38.3
If I get expense money just for the last 2 years of college	21.2	25.3	21.6	22.7
If I have to go to summer camp	17.7	17.4	16.1	14.0
If my college tuition is paid (Scholarship Program)	45.0	50.5	43.9	48.1
If I get to go to the college of my choice	47.5	58.5	47.1	52.6
If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income	38.5	44.3	37.0	42.9
If I have to go into the military service	26.3	31.8	24.9	28.5
If I have to take courses in military subjects in college	18.6	21.3	16.1	22.2
If I have to drill (march) on campus	23.5	27.4	21.5	25.1
How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college	38.7	43.7	32.1	37.7
How many years I have to serve in the Reserves after I complete Active Duty	30.2	32.4	26.7	33.1

TABLE III-6

in their decision to apply for a college military officer training program:

(1) If I get to go to the college of my choice;

(2) If my college tuition is paid;

(3) How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college;

(4) If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income; and

(5) If I get expense money for all 4 years of college.

Each of the more important influences listed above also received a higher level of endorsement in 1973 than in 1972, although the increases generally failed to attain statistical significance. A noteworthy exception was the increased endorsement of attending the college of one's choice among <u>males</u> from 1972 (48%) to 1973 (59%). A further indication of the importance of this particular reason is demonstrated as follows: Respondents were asked what they would do if their preferred college did <u>not</u> have an ROTC program. In the 1973 survey, between 51%-61% of male and 54%-69% of female potential applicants to the ROTC Scholarship program asserted that they would attend their preferred school anyway. This implies a willingness to forego ROTC enrollment in favor of attending the college of one's choice.

Further analyses were performed to determine if these reasons were accorded a strong influence in the decision to apply to these programs by sub-samples of male and female high school youth classified as potential applicants for these programs, compared to men and women in general.

Table III-7 presents data on potential male applicants to the ROTC Scholarship programs, and for men in general. In 1972 and 1973, male potential applicants were more likely to endorse the following reasons than were men in general:

(1) "Obtaining the college of my choice"; and

(2) "Paid college tuition".

(The differences were statistically significant in each case with the exception of Navy ROTC applicants in 1972, compared to men in general in 1972.) In each survey, potential Army ROTC Scholarship applicants cited "If I get paid to go to college regardless of my father's income" at a higher rate than did men in general. In each survey, potential USAF ROTC Scholarship applicants cited "Whether I become an aviation officer" at a higher rate than did men in general.

Table III-8 contains findings on the endorsement of specific reasons by female potential applicants to ROTC Scholarship programs, and for women in general. In both surveys, potential applicants tended to cite the reasons "If my college tuition is paid" and "If I get expense money for all 4 years of college" more frequently than did women in general. In the 1973 survey, potential female applicants to Navy and Air Force programs attributed influence to "Obtaining the college of my choice" and to "How much money I get each month I'm in college"

SPECIFIC REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: Male College-Bound High School Seniors

Specific Considerations	Potential Applicants: 1972 Survey				Potential Applicants: 1973 Survey			
	Army	Navy	USAF	Total Males	Army	Navy	USAF	Total Males
Which particular Service I am trained for (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps)	36.0	36.8	34.5	22.2	35.4	41.8	45.5	27.0
Whether I become an aviation officer (get to fly) or not	18.0	22.7	31.1	13.0	24.0	23.2	34.5	18.0
Whether I become a "ground" officer (do not get to fly) or not	21.5	22.7	24.3	14.2	17.2	20.5	20.0	15.7
How much money I get each month I'm in college (subsistence allowance)	43.0	42.1	52.8	33.2	47.9	33.2	44.0	35.9
If I get expense money for all 4 years of college	48.3	45.0	61.0	36.8	68.8	42.3	48.4	42.0
If I get expense money just for the last 2 years of college	23.3	24.8	33.3	21.2	34.9	25.5	25.5	25.3
If I have to go to summer camp	16.9	20.7	18.7	17.7	15.6	16.8	16.7	17.4
If my college tuition is paid (Scholarship Program)	64.0	55.8	65.2	45.0	73.0	63.6	65.5	50.5
If I get to go to the college of my choice	58.1	55.8	59.9	47.5	76.0	74.1	76.0	58.5
If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income	56.4	48.8	48.7	38.5	59.9	50.9	52.7	44.3
If I have to go into the military service	20.9	28.1	25.1	26.3	33.9	26.8	34.5	31.8
If I have to take courses in military subjects in college	14.0	20.7	20.6	18.6	20.8	20.9	19.6	21.3
If I have to drill (march) on campus	15.1	27.3	21.7	23.5	17.7	22.3	26.2	27.4
How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college	41.9	35.5	38.6	38.7	43.2	41.8	50.9	43.7
How many years I have to serve in the Reserves after I complete Active Duty	25.0	26.0	27.0	30.2	34.4	32.3	34.9	32.4

TABLE III-7

SPECIFIC REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: Female College-Bound High School Seniors

Specific Considerations	Potential Applicants: 1972 Survey				Potential Applicants: 1973 Survey			
	Army	Navy	USAF	Total Females	Army	Navy	USAF	Total Females
Which particular Service I am trained for (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps)	36.5	33.3	33.6	20.8	42.7	35.9	48.7	22.2
Whether I become an aviation officer (get to fly) or not	6.8	13.4	11.8	7.7	21.4	12.2	14.6	10.7
Whether I become a "ground" officer (do not get to fly) or not	20.3	22.4	19.1	11.0	29.2	15.6	12.6	11.9
How much money I get each month I'm in college (subsistence allowance).	41.2	36.2	31.4	29.0	43.8	49.8	54.3	32.1
If I get expense money for all 4 years of college	56.1	54.9	47.3	36.8	49.5	54.0	51.3	38.3
If I get expense money just for the last 2 years of college	24.3	29.3	26.8	21.8	32.3	32.9	24.1	22.7
If I have to go to summer camp	20.3	9.3	5.5	16.1	17.2	21.5	12.6	14.0
If my college tuition is paid (Scholarship Program)	62.2	63.0	55.5	43.9	63.0	72.2	63.3	48.1
If I get to go to the college of my choice	64.9	62.2	59.1	47.1	61.5	67.5	69.8	52.6
If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income	54.1	50.8	45.0	37.0	45.8	55.7	52.8	42.9
If I have to go into the military service	29.7	33.7	24.1	24.9	31.3	25.7	26.1	28.5
If I have to take courses in military subjects in college	13.5	15.0	13.2	16.1	20.3	18.1	22.6	22.2
If I have to drill (march) on campus	16.9	17.5	15.5	21.5	26.6	27.0	28.6	25.1
How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college	43.9	42.7	36.4	32.1	45.8	42.6	43.7	37.7
How many years I have to serve in the Reserves after I complete Active Duty	31.1	38.6	26.8	26.7	43.2	40.1	43.2	33.1

TABLE III-8

at a significantly higher rate than did women in general.

Table III-9 presents data on the endorsement of these reasons by male potential applicants to the ROTC Non-scholarship programs, and by men in general. In the 1973 survey, potential male applicants attributed strong influence to "obtaining college of their choice", "paid college tuition", and "which Service they were trained for" at a higher rate than did men in general.

Table III-10 contains data on the extent of strong influence attributed each specific reason by female applicants to ROTC Non-scholarship programs, and by women in general. In the 1973 survey, female applicants to each program cited "which particular Service I am trained for", "if my college tuition is paid", and "obtaining the college of my choice" more often than women in general.

In summary, potential applicants to ROTC programs in 1973 tended to endorse certain specific reasons as influential in the decision to apply for military officer training at higher rates than did respondents in general. The following reasons were often endorsed:

(1) Obtaining the college of their choice; and

(2) If their college tuition is paid (Scholarship program).

These major reasons were endorsed by respondents regardless of the type of ROTC program, the Service which sponsored the various ROTC programs, and independent of the sex of the respondent.

SPECIFIC REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC NON-SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: Male College-Bound High School Seniors

Specific Considerations	Potential Applicants: 1972 Survey				Potential Applicants: 1973 Survey			
	Army	Navy	USAF	Total Males	Army	Navy	USAF	Total Males
Which particular Service I am trained for (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps)	33.0	38.0	33.9	22.2	45.3	44.1	46.7	27.0
Whether I become an aviation officer (get to fly) or not	19.1	23.1	27.0	13.0	21.2	19.2	34.3	18.0
Whether I become a "ground" officer (do not get to fly) or not	24.2	23.1	24.8	14.2	19.6	23.6	25.7	15.7
How much money I get each month I'm in college (subsistence allowance)	47.9	39.4	46.5	33.2	57.0	37.6	47.1	35.9
If I get expense money for all 4 years of college	51.6	42.6	53.5	36.8	61.5	47.6	52.4	42.0
If I get expense money just for the last 2 years of college	27.4	17.6	34.8	21.2	34.1	29.7	25.7	25.3
If I have to go to summer camp	15.8	21.8	20.9	17.7	13.4	18.3	16.2	17.4
If my college tuition is paid (Scholarship Program)	67.0	53.7	63.0	45.0	76.0	69.4	65.2	55.0
If I get to go to the college of my choice	60.9	57.9	63.5	47.5	78.2	72.5	72.4	58.5
If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income	54.9	47.7	46.1	38.5	60.9	54.1	52.9	44.3
If I have to go into the military service	23.7	25.5	23.5	26.3	34.1	27.5	36.7	31.8
If I have to take courses in military subjects in college	14.9	21.3	20.9	18.6	21.8	21.4	19.5	21.3
If I have to drill (march) on campus	16.3	25.5	18.7	23.5	21.2	24.9	26.7	27.4
How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college	51.6	33.8	32.2	38.7	46.4	43.7	44.8	43.7
How many years I have to serve in the Reserves after I complete Active Duty	29.1	23.1	24.8	30.2	33.5	30.6	36.2	32.4

TABLE III-9

SPECIFIC REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC NON-SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: Female College-Bound High School Seniors

Specific Considerations	Potential Applicants: 1972 Survey				Potential Applicants: 1973 Survey			
	Army	Navy	USAF	Total Females	Army	Navy	USAF	Total Females
Which particular Service I am trained for (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps)	31.0	30.1	35.8	20.8	35.9	35.5	40.8	22.2
Whether I become an aviation officer (get to fly) or not	13.6	11.2	16.3	7.7	22.5	9.7	14.6	10.7
Whether I become a "ground" officer (do not get to fly) or not	25.8	18.9	17.9	11.0	25.4	16.1	12.7	11.9
How much money I get each month I'm in college (subsistence allowance)	38.5	34.5	30.9	29.0	44.0	41.0	41.4	32.1
If I get expense money for all 4 years of college	54.0	51.0	50.4	36.8	43.1	47.9	51.0	38.3
If I get expense money just for the last 2 years of college	31.0	23.3	30.9	21.6	33.0	27.6	20.4	22.7
If I have to go to summer camp	21.1	11.2	9.8	16.1	21.1	15.2	11.5	14.0
If my college tuition is paid (Scholarship Program)	65.3	53.9	53.7	43.9	68.4	64.1	59.2	48.1
If I get to go to the college of my choice	68.5	51.9	69.9	47.1	63.6	67.7	66.9	52.6
If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income	48.8	49.5	35.8	37.0	54.5	54.4	53.5	42.9
If I have to go into the military service	43.2	24.3	22.0	24.9	36.4	19.4	14.6	28.5
If I have to take courses in military subjects in college	26.8	12.1	18.7	16.1	30.6	13.4	8.3	22.2
If I have to drill (march) on campus	27.7	19.9	17.9	21.5	32.1	23.0	21.0	25.1
How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college	53.1	41.3	35.0	32.1	51.2	38.7	31.8	37.7
How many years I have to serve in the Reserves after I complete Active Duty	40.8	35.9	26.8	26.7	49.8	35.0	35.7	33.1

TABLE III-10

EDUCATIONAL EXPECTATIONS AND LIFE GOALS

Analyses were also performed to determine the ultimate educational expectations and extent of endorsement of several life goals among college-bound high school youth. There were essentially no differences in either expected educational achievement and endorsement of life goals between the total samples and the sub-samples of potential applicants to the various military officer training programs. Hence, results are presented for the total respondents in each survey, controlling on the sex of the respondent. Results appear in Table III-11.

There was a significant increase in advanced degree expectations of both men and women from 1972 to 1973. Table III-11 shows that the majority of college-bound high school youth expect to earn at least a college degree, and a substantial percentage envision pursuing their education beyond the undergraduate level. In each survey, men were more likely to anticipate advanced degree work than women.

There was no change in the importance accorded any of the specified life goals among males from 1972 to 1973. The most important life goals of men in both surveys were "making a lot of money" and "having a secure, steady job". For women the most important life goal in each survey was "helping other people." There was an increase in endorsement of the goal of "having a secure, steady job" among women from 1972 to 1973. The objective of "making a lot of money" declined in importance for women from 1972 to 1973.

In summary, a majority of both male and female respondents aspired to at least a college degree. Males endorsed "making a lot of money" and "having a secure, steady job" as important life goals. Females, however, selected "helping other people" as the most important life goal. In each

SELECTED GOALS AND EXPECTATIONS OF YOUTH

Base: College-Bound High School Students

	MALES		FEMALES	
	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	1972 (%)	1973 (%)
Expected Level of Education				
College Degree	68.0	59.9	75.5	67.5
Beyond College	32.0	40.1	24.4	32.5
	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0
Most Important Life Goal*				
Working for a better society	11.5	7.8	13.9	9.8
Doing challenging work	8.2	9.4	8.3	10.4
Making a lot of money	19.1	20.4	12.6	7.6
Learning as much as I can	9.9	10.0	17.0	15.2
Helping other people	13.4	11.6	22.9	27.8
Having a secure, steady job	18.2	19.4	12.0	18.0
Being able to do what I want to in a job	12.0	12.1	8.6	5.7
Raising my own social level	1.2	1.3	-	1.3
Recognition/Status	.7	.6	.8	.3
Adventure/Excitement	4.3	6.0	2.6	2.2

* Excludes "Don't know" and "No answer".

TABLE III-11

survey, these findings held for male and female respondents in general, as well as for male and female respondents classified as potential applicants.

TECHNICAL DETAILS

The observed differences in endorsement of reasons by potential applicants and by the total sample were computed and compared to the differences needed to achieve statistical significance (see Appendix A). This comparative evaluation provides a conservative estimate of the significance of differences in the rates of endorsement of each reason, for potential applicants (men or women) versus the total sample of men and women, respectively, for each survey.

The test is conservative, in that the rates of endorsement for the total samples (men or women) could be considered population estimates which would have no error. In contrast, rates used to derive the values in Appendix A assume two independent samples, with rates of endorsement for each sample that involve error.

In general, the difference in rate of endorsement of each reason between potential applicants and the total sample had to exceed approximately 11% to achieve statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level.

IV. AWARENESS OF OFFICER COMPENSATION, ROTC, AND OTHER MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

A major assumption underlying this research was that program awareness functioned as a logical prerequisite to the formation of favorable attitudes toward the various precommissioning programs. For this reason, questions were developed to assess the level of knowledge and awareness of ROTC and other military officer training programs. Particular emphasis was placed on the topic of officer pay, due to the increases in military compensation which preceded each survey administration. Other questions concerned awareness of the various programs by (1) name and (2) sponsoring branch of service. Finally, more detailed questions about ROTC programs were employed to assess knowledge of these particular programs. This chapter reviews major findings for these topics.

In both the 1972 and 1973 survey administrations, these questions were asked before the respondent was given any information about the various programs -- hence their replies indicate preexisting levels of knowledge and awareness. Comparisons of 1972 and 1973 responses were made using approximate tests of statistical significance (see Appendix A).

AWARENESS OF OFFICER COMPENSATION

Each respondent was asked to: (1) specify the date of the most recent pay increase for beginning officers; (2) specify both the current total entry earnings (pay and allowances) and the current entry base pay for an officer; and (3) estimate whether total entry pay for officers was more, less, or about the same as the earnings of a college graduate in his first (civilian) job. Results appear in Table IV-1.

ACCURACY IN KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF MILITARY OFFICER COMPENSATION

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

Percent Correctly Reporting:	MALES		FEMALES	
	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	1972 (%)	1973 (%)
Date of the Most Recent Pay Increase *	26.1	13.6	12.5	9.8
Range of Total Officer Entry Earnings ($601-800/month)	8.9	10.4	3.7	6.8
Amount of Entry Officer Base Pay ($550/month)	10.4	11.0	5.8	7.8
Equivalence of Officer and College Graduate Pay	29.5	34.9	37.5	38.2

* The correct answer in the 1972 Survey was "January, 1972".
The correct answer in the 1973 Survey was "January, 1973".

TABLE IV-1

For males in the 1973 survey, only 14% knew the correct date of the last officer pay increase, and only 10% to 11% knew the correct amounts of total entry earnings and entry base pay for a military officer. For females in the 1973 survey, only 10% knew the date of the last officer pay increase, and only 7% to 8% knew the correct amounts of total entry earnings and entry base pay for a military officer. In general, these findings constitute a low level of awareness of military officer compensation among both male and female college-bound high school seniors.

Between the 1972 and 1973 survey administrations, there was a significant decrease in the number of respondents who knew the approximate date of this last pay increase for starting officers.* However, there was also a slight (but not statistically significant) increase from 1972 to 1973 in the number of respondents who knew the correct amount of total entry earnings and the amount of entry base pay for a military officer.**

In spite of a lack of knowledge with respect to officer pay, many respondents in both surveys felt that total entry pay for officers was equivalent to the money which a college graduate would earn in his first job. Among males in the 1973 survey, 35% thought officer earnings were equivalent to the pay of a college graduate in an initial job. This was a significant increase over the value found in 1972. There was no difference from 1972 to 1973 in the percentage of women who thought that initial college graduate earnings and officer earnings were the same (38%).

---

*It might prove instructive to assess the extent ot publicity accorded each pay increase to determine if the January 1972 increase was more highly publicized than the January 1973 pay increase.

**It was also found that a substantial percentage of respondents in both surveys underestimated officer total entry pay (37-49% in 1972; 40-48% in 1973) and entry base pay (41-53% in 1972; and 42-44% in 1973).

AWARENESS OF VARIOUS TRAINING PROGRAMS

To assess the level of awareness of college-based military officer training programs, each respondent was asked to: (1) indicate if he had heard of each of the following programs: ROC, AVROC, PLC, and ROTC; and (2) identify the service(s) which sponsored these particular programs. The findings on claimed awareness of the programs by name are presented first.

In both surveys, the vast majority of respondents claimed to have heard of ROTC programs (95% or more). In contrast, a very low level of awareness was found for the PLC program (only 6% to 7% of respondents in each survey had heard of PLC). In general, claimed program awareness did not change from 1972 to 1973. For example, approximately 20% of male respondents in each survey claimed to have heard of the AVROC program. However, 15% of the men in 1973 claimed to have heard of the ROC program and this represented significant decline from a 21% level of awareness for ROC noted in 1972. In 1973, 12% of the women claimed to have heard of the AVROC program and 14% claimed to have heard of the ROC program. Comparable levels for 1972 were 14% for AVROC and 18% for ROC. Results are given in Table IV-2.

Next, these levels of awareness were validated by asking respondents who claimed awareness of a program (only) to identify the sponsoring service(s) for the particular program. This analysis revealed the existence of considerable confusion with respect to program sponsorship. It also demonstrated the need for caution in interpreting the previous data on claimed awareness of the various programs by name.

In each survey, the majority of the respondents who claimed to have heard of ROTC correctly attributed the ROTC program to the Army (over 60% in each survey).

CLAIMED AWARENESS OF SELECTED MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

Percent Who Claim Awareness of:	MALES		FEMALES	
	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	1972 (%)	1973 (%)
ROC	21.0	15.4	17.6	14.1
PLC	6.7	6.5	6.6	5.8
ROTC	97.0	98.4	94.6	96.8
AVROC	19.4	20.7	13.8	11.8

TABLE IV-2

However, attribution of ROTC sponsorship to the Navy or to the Air Force was much lower in both surveys, i.e., less than one-third of respondents who claimed to have heard of ROTC attributed ROTC to the Navy or the Air Force. Table IV-3 presents the findings for each program.

In the 1973 survey, most respondents who claimed to have heard of the PLC program could correctly attribute the program to the Marine Corps (71% to 72%). However, it should be recalled that the claimed level of awareness for the PLC program was low in both surveys (between 6% and 7%). Hence, the apparent increase in PLC sponsor identification from 1972 to 1973 represents at the most a change of only 1% to 2% in the total samples. Increases of this magnitude would not achieve statistical significance.

In both surveys, awareness of the sponsor of the ROC and AVROC programs has found to be low. Interestingly, the majority of respondents in both surveys who claimed awareness of the Navy's AVROC program believed that the Air Force was the program sponsor (55-61% in 1972; and 66-73% in 1973).

DETAILED KNOWLEDGE OF THE ROTC PROGRAM

Knowledge of details regarding the ROTC program was assessed by querying each respondent on the following topics: (a) the particular type of college costs paid for by ROTC, (b) knowledge of the existence of both scholarship and non-scholarship programs, (c) awareness that scholarship and subsistence benefits differ; and (d) awareness of the correct amount of the current monthly subsistence allowance ($100). Results appear in Table IV-4.

Among males in the 1973 survey, 32% knew that ROTC paid both college tuition and other expenses, 29% claimed to have heard of both scholarship

CORRECT SPONSOR IDENTIFICATION FOR SELECTED MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

Percent Correct Identification of Sponsoring Service	MALES 1972 (%)	MALES 1973 (%)	FEMALES 1972 (%)	FEMALES 1973 (%)
ROC (% Navy)	30.1	28.6	31.7	38.3
PLC (% USMC)	35.1	72.0	50.5	71.1
ROTC:				
% Army	60.6	64.1	62.1	61.7
% Navy	24.2	25.7	21.9	25.4
% USAF	29.5	31.2	26.1	32.2
AVROC (% Navy)	21.3	23.9	19.7	19.0

TABLE IV-3

ACCURATE KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF THE ROTC PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

Percent Correct Knowledge/ Awareness of:	MALES 1972 (%)	MALES 1973 (%)	FEMALES 1972 (%)	FEMALES 1973 (%)
ROTC pays both college tuition and other expenses	28.7	32.3	27.1	29.5
Both Scholarship and Non-scholarship programs	32.4	29.0	25.1	17.8
The distinction between scholarship and subsistence allowances	47.0	48.2	46.4	47.4
The precise amount of the current monthly subsistence allowance ($100)	24.8	27.8	17.2	15.4

TABLE IV-4

and non-scholarship programs, and 48% recognized a distinction between the allowances under these programs. However, only 28% could specify the correct amount of the current monthly subsistence allowance ($100). Equivalent or slightly lower levels of knowledge and awareness were found for women, in both the 1972 and 1973 surveys.

There were no statistically significant differences from 1972 to 1973 in levels of knowledge and awareness of these topics among men. However, on three of the four measures, there was a slight increase from 1972 to 1973 in the percentage of male respondents who possessed correct knowledge or awareness of these details of the ROTC program.

Finally, each respondent was asked to specify the term of obligated service for graduates of ROTC scholarship programs. A separate response was required for each program; Army ROTC, Navy ROTC, and Air Force ROTC. Table IV-5 presents the results for both surveys in terms of the percent correct response. Awareness that an ROTC scholarship requires a four year commitment was quite low in both surveys (31% to 38% for men; 23% to 32% for women). In general, women were significatly less aware than men of the term of obligation for an ROTC scholarship. For men, there was no significant change from 1972 to 1973 in awareness of ROTC program service obligation. For women, the only significant change from 1972 to 1973 occurred with respect to awareness of the Air Force ROTC four year service commitment, where a significant decrease was found (32% in 1972 and 24% in 1973).

The four year service obligation was most frequently attributed to the Air Force than to the other Services in both the 1972 and 1973 surveys.

CORRECT KNOWLEDGE OF THE TERM OF OBLIGATED SERVICE FOR ROTC SCHOLARSHIP GRADUATES

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

Percent Aware of Four Year Obligation, by Service	MALES 1972 (%)	MALES 1973 (%)	FEMALES 1972 (%)	FEMALES 1973 (%)
Army ROTC	31.1	35.2	23.4	22.5
Navy ROTC	32.5	32.5	23.5	23.3
USAF ROTC	37.8	38.0	31.6	24.3

TABLE IV-5

This finding held for each population with the exception of females in the 1973 survey where no difference was found between Services.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT ROTC

Each respondent was asked two questions concerning potential sources of information about ROTC programs. First, exposure to service advertising for college ROTC was explored. Second, personal communication from various influential persons (parents, peers, school authorities, recruiters) was examined.

Respondents in both surveys were asked: "Have you seen or heard any advertising for college ROTC? If so, for which college ROTC program have you seen or heard it?" Respondents could either (1) indicate exposure to one or more of the programs individually; (2) claim exposure to all of the service programs; or (3) report no exposure to advertising for college ROTC. The general findings indicate a high degree of reported exposure to advertising for college ROTC programs. In the 1973 survey, 82% of men and 72% of the women claimed that they had seen some ROTC advertising. Youth who reported exposure to any ROTC advertising most often claimed that they had seen or heard advertising for Army ROTC (only) or for all three service ROTC programs. In both 1972 and 1973, the mention of exposure to advertising for Navy ROTC and Air Force ROTC was at much lower levels than the mention of exposure to Army ROTC advertising. There was no change in reported exposure to advertising for Navy ROTC or Air Force ROTC from 1972 to 1973. In contrast, there was a significant increase in the number of males reporting exposure to Army ROTC ads in 1973 (39%)compared to 1972 (33%). There was also an increase in the number of females reporting exposure to advertising for all

REPORTED EXPOSURE TO ADVERTISING FOR COLLEGE ROTC

Base: College-Bound High School Students

Reported Service ROTC Program Advertising Exposure	MALES		FEMALES	
	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	1972 (%)	1973 (%)
Army ROTC	32.7	39.1	32.6	30.9
Navy ROTC	10.5	10.5	8.7	8.5
USAF ROTC	13.7	13.9	15.0	14.1
All of Them	32.8	33.2	19.6	27.2
Have not seen nor heard any advertising	22.2	18.0	35.1	28.4

TABLE IV-6

ROTC programs from 1972 (20%) to 1973 (27%). See Table IV-6 for results.

Respondents in each survey were also asked to answer the following open-ended question: "Except for now, who has ever given you any information about ROTC?" Responses to the question were content-analyzed and coded for tabulation. In each survey, a substantial number of respondents claimed that no one had given them information about ROTC. In the 1973 survey, 39% of men and 50% of women made this reply. There was a significant increase in the number of males making this claim in 1973 (39%) compared to 1972 (32%).* In each survey, men tended to cite (1) parents/relatives/friends; or (2) recruiting materials or the recruiter, as their main sources of information about ROTC. In each survey, women tended to cite parents/relatives/friends as the main source of information about ROTC. There were no significant differences in the mention of the various sources of information from 1972 to 1973. See Table IV-7 for details.

DISCUSSION

Although detailed levels of awareness of the military officer training programs remained low, there is some evidence that suggest that Army ROTC advertising may be having a positive impact on youth. While the increases in awareness do not achieve statistical significance, it is useful to note that from 1972 to 1973, there were slight increases in: (1) the proportion of male youth who identified the Army as a sponsor of the ROTC program; (2) the proportion of male youth who knew that the Army ROTC program required a four year service obligation; and (3) the general level of awareness among males of the correct amount of monthly subsistence pay for ROTC ($100). These

*However, this finding may be an artifact of response coding. Note that the category "Don't know/No answer" included 4% of both males and females in 1972, but less than 1% in 1973.

PERSONAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT ROTC

Base: College-Bound High School Students

Source of Information	MALES 1972 (%)	MALES 1973 (%)	FEMALES 1972 (%)	FEMALES 1973 (%)
Parent/Relative/Friends (Net)	25.6	20.8	20.8	19.6
Father	5.6	6.2	3.4	2.5
Mother	.8	1.5	.2	.8
Sisters/Brothers	4.9	4.5	4.3	4.1
Other Relatives	3.1	5.2	4.1	4.8
Friends/School Acquaintances	14.1	8.4	12.0	9.9
Recruiting Material (Net)	27.4	26.0	14.0	11.3
Pamphlets/Brochures	9.9	10.3	4.4	2.2
Advertisements	4.2	1.7	3.0	1.3
Military Recruiter at School	8.2	6.9	5.9	3.7
Military Recruiter away from School	7.6	7.7	1.6	4.8
Counselors/Teachers	11.3	11.4	3.6	7.7
People in Service	1.7	2.0	.8	1.5
Members of ROTC	3.6	4.7	2.1	6.6
Media (Net)	7.5	6.7	12.6	10.7
Newspapers/Magazines/Books	3.0	2.7	5.6	2.5
TV/Radio	5.4	5.1	8.5	9.5
Draft Board	.4	-	-	-
Other	2.3	1.9	1.9	1.5
No One	32.0	38.9	47.6	49.7
Don't know/No answer	4.1	-	3.9	.4

favorable changes would be expected, assuming the effectiveness of Army ROTC advertising. However, the most important question remains one of whether these slight increases in knowledge will help convince youth to apply for ROTC. The present data on enrollment potential are ambiguous with respect to this issue. From 1972 to 1973, there were small (1% to 2%) increases in actual reported rates of application for an ROTC scholarship among men and women (Table I-2), and small (2%) increases in enrollment potential for the Army Scholarship program among men and women. (Table I-3). None of these increases achieved statistical significance. Hence, the hypothesis that these minor changes in ROTC enrollment potential and application behavior are other than chance occurrences cannot be supported by the present data. Moreover, even if these slight favorable changes from 1972 to 1973 were found to achieve statistical significance, it would be impossible to attribute causation uniquely to Army ROTC advertising, in lieu of consideration of other factors operative in this time period (increases in college expenses, inflation, recruiter activity, etc.).

Nonetheless, it is interesting to observe these favorable changes in Army enrollment potential, application behavior, and awareness of Army ROTC. Additional (future) research should be conducted to provide definitive information on the effectiveness of ROTC advertising and recruitment activities for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Bibliography

_____. An investigation of ROTC among college and high school students. New York: N.W. Ayer & Sons, Inc. and Daniel Yankelovich, Inc. March 1972.

Fisher, Jr. A.H. & Harford, M.A. Enrollment and career potential for college-based military officer training programs: Results of a survey conducted in May 1972. Office of the Secretary of Defense, MA 72-3, November 1972.

Johnston, J. & Bachman, J.G. Youth in transition: Young men and military service. Vol. 5. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1972.

Mosteller, F. & Bush, R.R. Selected quantitative techniques. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology, Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Walker, [illegible] & Lev, J. Statistical inference. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1953.

APPENDIX A

Approximate Sampling Tolerances for Differences
Between Two Survey Percentages at or Near These Levels

Size of Samples Being Compared	10% or 90%	20% or 80%	30% or 70%	40% or 60%	50%
500 and 500	4	5	6	6	6
and 250	5	6	7	7	8
and 100	6	9	10	11	11
250 and 250	5	7	8	9	9
and 100	7	9	11	10	12
100 and 100	8	11	13	14	14

(95 in 100 Confidence Level)

This table provides an approximate test of the statistical significance of the difference between any two percentages at the .05 level of significance. An illustration of the use of the table is as follows:

For two sample sizes of approximately 500 and percentages ranging around 10%, the difference in rates between two samples would have to exceed 4% in order to achieve statistical signifance at the .05 level of significance.

Note that two independent samples are assumed.

APPENDIX B

APPLICANT POTENTIAL ITEMS FROM THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

INTERVIEWER: Q's. 10A THRU 10D MUST BE ASKED OF ALL RESPONDENTS. HOWEVER, SINCE WE DO NOT WANT TO HAVE ALL RESPONDENTS ASKED THE QUESTIONS IN THE SAME ORDER, PLEASE START WITH THE QUESTION "X'ED" IN RED. CONTINUE SEQUENTIALLY THROUGH Q. 10D THEN GO BACK AND ASK THOSE QUESTIONS WHICH PRECEDED THE QUESTION YOU STARTED WITH.

SAY TO ALL RESPONDENTS . . . Here is a card (HAND RESPONDENT GREEN CARD "A") which describes a certain type of military officer training program. Please read the card carefully to familiarize yourself with the program and then I would like to get your reaction.

10a.

GREEN CARD "A"

The Army, Navy, and Air Force each have College military officer training programs called ROTC* scholarship programs. The Services pay up to 4 years of tuition, fees and provide money for expenses toward a college education. These programs have military courses on campus, and require military training. They also require you to attend summer camps for which you are paid. The choice of schools is restricted to about 375 colleges with ROTC programs. You serve for 4 years as an officer in the Service for which you were trained and an additional period if you become a pilot or navigator.

* ROTC stands for Reserve Officer Training Corps

(AFTER RESPONDENT HAS READ THE CARD, HAND RESPONDENT CARD #10 AND ASK:) Which of these statements would apply to you as regards the program offered by the Army? (CHECK ONE ANSWER ONLY) (RECORD BELOW)

Which statement would apply to you as regards the Navy, which includes the U. S. Marine Corps as an option? (CHECK ONE ANSWER ONLY)

And how about the program offered by the Air Force? (CHECK ONE ANSWER ONLY)

	SERVICE: Army	Navy	Air Force
a. I would apply for this program	30-1	31-1	32-1
b. I would not apply for this program	2	2	2
c. Don't know if I would apply for this program . .	3	3	3

(IF "WOULD APPLY" FOR NAVY PROGRAM, ASK:) Would you prefer to enter the MARINE CORPS or the NAVY after graduation?

Marine Corps 33-1 Navy 2

SAY TO ALL RESPONDENTS . . . Here is a card (HAND RESPONDENT BLUE CARD "B") which describes a certain type of military officer training program. Please read the card carefully to familiarize yourself with the program and then I would like to get your reaction.

10b.

BLUE CARD "B" *

The Army, Navy, and Air Force each have a College military officer training program called ROTC Subsistence Allowance Program. The Services provide a monthly allowance for the Junior and Senior years. Usually, men enter these programs after completing 2 years of "Basic ROTC" in their Freshmen and Sophomore years. These programs have military courses on campus, and require military training. They also require you to attend summer camps for which you are paid. The programs are only offered at 375 schools with ROTC programs. You serve 2 years as an officer in the Army after graduating. You serve 3 years as a Navy officer. You serve 4 years as an Air Force officer. You serve an additional period if you should become a pilot or navigator.

(AFTER RESPONDENT HAS READ THE CARD, HAND RESPONDENT CARD #10 AND ASK:) Which of these statements would apply to you as regard the program offered by the Army? (CHECK ONE ANSWER ONLY) (RECORD BELOW)

Which statement would apply to you as regards the Navy, which includes the U. S. Marine Corps as an option? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

* NOTE: In this report, this program is called the Non-scholarship program.

And how about the program offered by the Air Force? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

	SERVICE: Army (2 Years)	Navy (3 Years)	Air Force (4 Years)
a. I would apply for this program	34-1	35-1	36-1
b. I would not apply for this program . .	2	2	2
c. Don't know if I would apply for this program	3	3	3

(IF "WOULD APPLY" FOR NAVY PROGRAM, ASK:) Would you prefer to enter the MARINE CORPS or the NAVY after graduation?

Marine Corps 37-1 Navy 2

SAY TO ALL RESPONDENTS . . . . Here is a card (HAND RESPONDENT YELLOW CARD "C") which describes a certain type of military officer training program. Please read the card carefully to familiarize yourself with the program and then I would like to get your reaction.

10c.

YELLOW CARD "C"

The Marine Corps has a College military officer training program called PLC (Platoon Leaders Class). For their last three years in college, a student may choose to receive a monthly subsistence allowance. Students are also paid to attend two 6-week summer camps, usually between the Freshmen-Sophomore years and the Junior-Senior years. There is no military course work on campus and no military training on campus. You attend any accredited college of your choice. You serve 2 1/2 to 4 years as an officer after graduating from college, depending on how many school years you received subsistence allowance. (Pilots and flight officers serve for longer periods.)

(AFTER RESPONDENT HAS READ THE CARD, HAND RESPONDENT CARD #10 AND ASK:) Which of these statements would apply to you as regards the PLC Program, requiring 2 1/2 to 4 years of service as an officer after graduating? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

Which statement would apply to you as regards the PLC Pilot Program, requiring 5 to 6 years of service as an officer after graduating? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

And how about the PLC Flight Officer Program, requiring 5 to 6 years of service as an officer after graduating? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

	PLC 2½-4 Years	PLC (PILOT) 5-6 Years	PLC (FLIGHT OFFICER) 5-6 Years
a. I would apply for this program . . .	38-1	39-1	40-1
b. I would not apply for this program .	2	2	2
c. Don't Know if I would apply for this program	3	3	3

SAY TO ALL RESPONDENTS . . . . Here is a card (HAND RESPONDENT PINK CARD "D") which describes a certain type of military officer training program. Please read the card carefully to familiarize yourself with the program and then I would like to get your reaction.

10d.

PINK CARD "D"

The Navy has two "off-campus" College military officer training programs. They are called ROC (Reserve Officer Corps) and AVROC (Aviation Reserve Officer Corps). In both programs, the Navy pays college men to attend two summer camps, one between the Junior-Senior years and the other upon completion of college. There is no military course work on campus and no military training on campus. You attend any school of your choice. In ROC, you serve 3 years as a Navy non-flight officer after graduating from college. In AVROC, you serve as a Navy pilot for 4 1/2 years, or as a Navy navigator for 3 1/2 years -- after you finish flight training.

(AFTER RESPONDENT HAS READ THE CARD, HAND RESPONDENT CARD #10 AND ASK:) Which of these statements would apply to you as regards the ROC Program? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

Which statement would apply to you as regards the AVROC (Pilot) Program? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

And how about the AVROC (Navigator) Program? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

	ROC (3 Years)	AVROC (Pilot) (4½ Years)	AVROC (Navigator) (3½ Years)
a. I would apply for this program	41-1	42-1	43-1
b. I would not apply for this program	2	2	2
c. Don't Know if I would apply for this program	3	3	3

APPENDIX C

Demographic Composition of the Surveys (Weighted Data)

	Males		Females	
	1972 (%)	1973 (%)	1972 (%)	1973 (%)
Age				
17 years or younger	42.0	60.5	50.1	64.8
18 years or older	57.9	39.4	49.9	35.1
	99.9	99.9	100.0	99.9
Race				
White	82.6	88.5	81.1	83.8
Non-Whites	17.4	11.5	18.9	16.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Annual Family Income				
Under $8,000	12.2	5.9	13.1	9.5
$8,000-$13,999	22.3	15.5	17.9	15.1
$14,000-$19,999	20.6	18.1	19.8	15.3
$20,000 or over	19.5	28.1	14.2	13.5
Refused/Don't Know	25.4	32.4	35.0	46.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9
Employment Status				
Full time	12.3	6.1	7.2	2.2
Part time	51.9	62.7	46.6	53.5
Not employed	35.4	31.2	46.2	44.2
	99.6*	100.0	100.0	99.9
Type of Neighborhood				
Large metropolitan	31.6	37.9	37.4	40.1
Small metropolitan	51.4	41.6	43.6	40.8
Non-metropolitan	17.0	20.5	18.9	19.0
	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.9
Geographic Region				
Northeast	22.4	22.3	22.5	22.8
North Central	27.5	26.3	26.7	26.9
South	32.7	33.4	32.8	32.3
West	17.3	17.9	17.9	18.0
	99.9	99.9	99.9	100.0

*.3% unclassified.

- END -